THE CHURCHMAN.

THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD, THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH.—1 Tim. iii. 15.

VOL. VI. No. 11. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 28, 1836. WHOLE NUMBER, 271.

For the Churchman.

Ode to the Memory of Archbishop Laud.

Servant of God, well done; well hast thou fought
The better fight, who single hast maintain'd,
Against revolted multitudes, the cause
Of truth, in word mightier than they in arms;
And for the testimony of truth hast borne
Universal reproach, far worse to bear
Than violence; for this was all thy care
To stand approved in sight of God, though worlds
Judged thee perverse.—*Paradise Lost, Book VI.*

If stern reproach from age to age,
If fiercest trials borne,
And specious lies on history's page
With epithets of scorn,
Or life laid meekly down for truth—
If such must be before, in sooth,
The martyr's crown is won,
How well the Church may number thee
Amid that glorious company.

"The rude eye of rebellion" glared
Upon thy long career,
Yet all for truth that spirit dared,
Which scoff, reproach, and jeer,
The hosts of anarchy array'd,
The red axe, and death's grim parade
Could never shake with fear:
Oh may the primate's mitre now,
And ever, bind as firm a brow!

Thou wert too stern, and didst deserve,
'T is said, that bitter wrath;
Too stern at least to shrink or swerve
From duty's narrow path;
Too stern to bend to lawless bands
Who threaten'd with unholy hands
Throne, altar, household hearth:
Who breasts and braves a storm so rough
Must needs be made of sternest stuff.

Thou hadst thy *faults*; but what were they
Who branded thee with *crime*;
Who scoff'd above thy bleeding clay,
And flung their taunts to time?
Oh! shame that those malignant jeers
Should echo yet in these far years,
And in this distant clime:
'T is time the sons should quench the fires
Lit up by their relentless sires.

Ay! what were they whom latter days,
Which still distain thy dust,
Have graced with epithets of praise,
Urn, mound, and storied bust?
The men whose deeds in glory shine,
While foul dishonor blackens thine?
Let broken faith and trust,
A murder'd king, and trampled laws,
Proclaim how holy was their cause.

Thou hadst thy faults; yet thine a heart
Pure, honest, faithful, true,
That would not stoop to petty art,
A universe to sue;
A soul, when fiercest tempests woke
Their wrath, that could not bend—and broke—
All done that man might do:
When waves the sinking bark o'erwhelm
The firmest hand must yield the helm.

Peace to thy ashes! gently laid
Beneath a reverend dome
That towers in Oxford's holy shade,
Thy cherish'd boyhood's home;
Where soothing praise and withering sneer
Can pierce no more the dull cold ear.
With toils for her o'ercome,*
'T was meet that thou at last shouldst rest
Upon thy Alma Mater's breast.

Time may do justice yet—disperse
The shadows from thy fame,
And bid the bards of deathless verse
Thy deeds and worth proclaim,
While history's hoary sages write
In characters of living light
Thy venerated name,
And other, worthier hands than mine,
Inscribe thy *martyr'd memory's* shrine.

Yet what were praise of man to thee,
When fear could bring no snare?
Thy toil was for eternity,
God's favor all thy care;
Striving for truth, nor smile, nor frown
Could gild or dim the promised crown
Thy victor brows will wear.
With God's approving glance to cheer
Man's smile or frown must disappear.

New-York, May 17, 1836. B. D. W.

* The Archbishop was Chancellor of the University of Oxford and most indefatigable in his exertions for her welfare.

COMMUNICATIONS.

For the Churchman.

CONGRUITY OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY WITH HUMAN REASON.

They who reject the doctrine of the trinity, do it on the ground of its being contradictory to their reason; i. e., they cannot comprehend it. On this ground, too, they are strong advocates for the unity of God. It must then be supposed that his unity they can comprehend; or why should they believe *that* and reject the doctrine of the trinity? Let then any man try, I care not how great or strong his abilities may be, to form an idea of any being but under some form or shape. But if a being has form, it must have parts; and if parts, it must be divisible; and if divisible, it cannot be perfect unity. So that he who believes the unity of God, believes what he does not, cannot comprehend; and has no right to find fault with those who believe the trinity in the Godhead, though they cannot comprehend it. They are both revealed to us—the unity and trinity of God—and ought both to be believed or both rejected by us.

All our knowledge of spirit and spiritual things is by analogy with our own nature. Now, analogy can never go beyond the capacity of that nature from which it is drawn. All analogical knowledge must, therefore, be obscure in proportion to the weakness or limited capacity of that nature from which it is made. Hence arises the impossibility of the human mind's ever comprehending, fully and clearly, the nature of the divine being, whom we call God. But though this knowledge be obscure, it is nevertheless certain, as far it goes; is a sure and rational foundation for our belief, and affords just and true rules and motives for our actions and conduct in life, and certain grounds for our hopes in the world to come. For instance; we form our idea of the power of God from analogy with the power of man. But this can only give us the knowledge that God is powerful, without informing us in what it consists, or how it is exerted. If we try to add infinity to this power, infinity is merely a negative term, and gives no positive idea; and, therefore, conveys no knowledge. We have in truth no idea of infinity, and can have none. All we can do is to add number to number, or succession to succession, or degree to degree, till it gets beyond our comprehension. But all these are parts or portions, and therefore cannot belong to infinity, which, as it has no limits, can have no parts.

What has been said of the power, may with equal propriety be said of the wisdom, knowledge, goodness of God. They are all infinite in themselves, even as He is infinite; and we can form no idea of them but in analogy with our own nature, and consequently none but dark and imperfect ideas, because we can have no adequate idea of infinity. In plain language, we cannot fully or perfectly comprehend the power, wisdom, knowledge, or goodness of God, any more than we can his essence. Is it therefore unreasonable to believe the power, wisdom, knowledge, and goodness of God, which we cannot comprehend? If not, why should it be thought unreasonable to believe the trinity of persons in the unity of God, because we cannot comprehend it?

In this way God speaks to us in the Bible, from one end to the other. It is all figure, either metaphor or analogy. In any other way it is impossible any divine revelation should be understood by us; because we have by nature no ideas but from the sensible objects of this world; and they give us no knowledge of spirit or of spiritual objects. Spiritual subjects must therefore be treated of, either when God speaks to us, or we to each other, by metaphor, or the substitution of one thing for another; by allusion to the things of this world or life, and by analogy to our present nature, to the powers and operations of our own minds.

Hence, too, it arises that the terms made use of in treating on these subjects are all metaphorical or analogical, and therefore not strictly and properly just and adequate. The power of God is expressed by human hands, and arms, and strength; the knowledge of God by human eyes; and the wisdom and goodness of God by human goodness and wisdom. But though this knowledge by analogy be dark and obscure, and not adequate to the nature of the things to which it relates, yet it is sure and certain. The mechanic who knows how to apply the rules of his art so as to obtain every advantage from them, may yet be in a great measure ignorant of the mathematical or philosophical principles on which they are founded. So this analogical knowledge, though not perfectly and strictly clear and adequate, is yet solid and certain, and sufficient for all the purposes of faith and practice in the Christian life. It enables us to know that God is true, and just, and good, and wise, and powerful, and holy, though it does not enable us fully to comprehend his nature. It is a sure foundation, and therefore a reasonable one, for our faith or belief, though God remain incomprehensible by us.

That the terms in which divine or spiritual knowledge is communicated to us, does not reach the full nature of the objects understood or represented by them, might be made evident by a great number of instances. God is styled the Father of the whole creation. This term then implies that all created things were produced by him, that he superintends and takes care of them as a father does of his offspring, that he has a right to command them as a father his children, and that they owe him reverence, love, and obedience, as children do their father. But it cannot mean that the creatures were produced by God in the way of human generation, to which the term *father* strictly and properly belongs. And with regard to the transcendent mystery of which I am now speaking, God is called the Father of Jesus Christ, and Christ is said to be the Son, the only-begotten Son of God; not because there is an exact and perfect similitude between the geniture of the Son of God and of the son of an earthly parent, but because the relation and term of father and son afford the best similitude in our nature by which to represent them to us. And we ought to understand by them that God is as truly the Father of the Son, and the Son as truly begotten of him, as any man is the father of his son, or his son is begotten by him, though in a way as much different from and superior to human generation as God is different from and superior to man.

The same observation will hold good with regard to the term *person*, when used to express the distinction which is made in the unity of God. In common use, *person* and *man* are equivocal terms, and are appropriated to one of the species as distinct from all the rest. With regard to the trinity it can only mean that in the unity or essence of God there is such a distinction as is best understood by us under that style; not that the distinction of persons in the trinity of the divine nature is just the same that there is between three persons or men, but because we could understand nothing of the matter as it is in itself, having neither ideas to conceive it nor words to express it; the divine goodness, in condescension to our capacity, hath thought good to represent it to us by analogy to the distinction of persons in our own nature—the only way in which we could form any conception of it; and to impress strongly on us the knowledge and belief of such a distinction in the divine nature, as was necessary to our understanding the principles of our holy religion, and to our obtaining the full benefit of redemption through Jesus the Saviour. At the same time that divine revelation informs us of this distinction in the nature of God, it teacheth us fully the unity of God—that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, though three persons, are but one God—all being of the same undivided essence—so that the work or operation of one is the work or operation of all; not by that consent of will by which three persons or men in this world choose or pursue the same thing, so as to make the united effort of three distinct wills in what they do, but by the necessity of nature; the three persons being of one essence, so as together to make or constitute that essence, have only one will, as undivided as is their essence.

The foundation of this analogy, or the capacity of man to apprehend this analogical representation of the nature of God, and of spiritual subjects, was laid in his nature at his creation. God said, *Let us make man in our image, after* (or according to) *our likeness*, (which plural mode of speaking can never be reconciled with the principles of those people who deny the distinction of persons in the Godhead.) *So* God *created man in his own image, in the image of* God *created he him.* He formed his body of *the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath* of lives, and not as our Bible reads it, *the breath of life.* The expression is plural, and plainly indicates that man has more lives than one. In this plurality of lives consists in a great degree that image of God in which man was created; and which constitutes him a resemblance of the trinity of the divine nature. St. Paul, writing to the Thessalonians, (1st Epistle, v. 23,) evidently adverts to this distinction of lives in the nature of man. After commending them to the peace of God to sanctify them wholly, he adds, *and I pray* God *your whole spirit, and soul, and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord* Jesus Christ. That we are acquainted with three distinct kinds of life in this world, the vegetative, animal, and intellectual or rational, needs no proof; and that these three lives are united in man, and are all necessary to his existence in his present state, would be no hard matter to demonstrate. Look at the growth of his body, at its functions, at his intellectual powers, and there will be but little if any room to doubt. Not to pursue a philosophical disquisition, if we take our faith from divine revelation, we must believe that man was created in the image of God, and that his nature has a threefold distinction in it, body, soul, and spirit; and that these three make one man—not by mutual consent or voluntary union, but by necessity of nature, having one mode of perception, one method of reasoning, one will, one understanding, one judgment, one memory, one conscience.

I do not say that this is a direct proof of the trinity of persons in God, in whose image and likeness man was originally created in a threefold nature, then acting in the most perfect unity and concord, now miserably distorted and too frequently at variance through the effect of sin, so that the will does not always choose and pursue what the judgment and conscience direct and approve. But I do say, it is a strong presumption of such a trinity in the divine nature; and that it is the sure foundation of that divine analogy by which God speaks to us, and forms our capacity to understand so much of the nature of God, and of spiritual subjects, as is necessary to our again recovering that divine nature which was lost by the fall, and a capacity of heavenly happiness, through the mediation of Christ, and the operation of the Holy Ghost, who, with the Father Almighty, are one God, blessed for ever. Catholicus.

For the Churchman.

CONGREGATIONALISM, NO. II.

Mr. Editor,—The attention of your readers has already been called to the evils attending the "*mutual watch*" of the Congregational church; its tendency to beget "slandering, backbiting, and impertinent intermeddling; censoriousness and condemnatory judging."—From fifteen years' experience as a member of this Church, I can bear my testimony to the truth of these charges, and can truly say that "the one-half has not been told:"—none but those who have been actual eye-witnesses of the results of this system of church discipline can have any correct idea of the disastrous consequences which flow from it. A very common result is the following.—From some trifling cause, a jealous and even hostile feeling springs up between neighbors A and B: perhaps one is more successful in business, and gets along better in the world than the other; or one has said something unkind in relation to the other, which a good brother has related to the party concerned; or the pigs, geese, or other animals of A, have broken into the premises of B, and done injury to his crops. They have a conference, but cannot agree on the extent of damages; hard words follow; one upbraids the other for keeping such unruly animals, the other retorts by accusing his neighbor of having the meanest fences in the whole town, (I speak here of what I have seen again and again.) The business is at length referred to arbitrators to settle,—they give their decision; and though the parties feel bound to abide by it, yet the matter does not end here. The *mutual watch*, which it was their *covenant duty* previously to their dispute to observe toward each other, henceforth is practised with tenfold diligence. Nothing, however trivial, escapes their Argus eyes; mole-hills are magnified to mountains; and fortunate will the church be, of which they are unworthy members, if it is not continually embroiled by their mutual charges and complaints. This is no imaginary case, but what I have witnessed repeatedly: and I give the following to illustrate what I wish to prove, as to the effects of this *mutual watch*.

The first case occurred in Connecticut, in a Congregational church under the pastoral care of my grandfather, in whose hand-writing are the documents from which I copy this history. A farmer in moderate circumstances took up some wheat on the Sabbath, for the purpose, as appears from the "Confession" which follows, of procuring a little flour to furnish bread for his sick family. It should be observed that it was in the year 1786, when hand-mills were generally used for grinding grain, in that part of the country, grist mills not having been introduced. A neighbor, who was on the *mutual watch*—every Lord's day at least—having witnessed the transaction, goes immediately and lodges a complaint in the church against his offending brother, who was immediately arraigned, tried, convicted, and sentenced to read the following *Confession;* which is in the hand-writing of the minister, and no doubt drawn up by him. Its *wording* shows how *he* regarded the matter, and is in effect an indirect censure upon the church.

"*S——y, January 2d,* 1786.

"I, the subscriber, finding that some of my brethren are grieved and offended with me as having profaigned the Sabbath in taking up some wheat on the Lord's day, and also for partaking at the sacrament, when as they suppose I was warned not to partake, because a complaint was entered against me:—as to the first particular, I did it *really thinking it was right, and a work of necessity for my sick family's relief*, but upon serious consideration, I am sensible I did *croud* on the Sabbath; I might have borrowed bread for my sick, till the then coming Monday; *I have erred, and been imprudent*, and given offence to my brethren. I am sorry I did it, and pray God to forgive my sin, and I desire the charity of the church, promising to be more careful in keeping the Sabbath for the future. And as to the other particular, I can truly say I did not know, and was not aprised that any complaint was carried in against me; if I had I should not have partook at that time—I desire the church to forgive my error wherein soever I have walked unbecomingly,
Signed for me,
Phineas Adams."

Mr. Adams' kind neighbor was now gratified, probably, by the disgrace thus heaped upon his offending brother by a public confession, and doubtless his own self-righteousness grew under the disciplinary acts like Jonah's gourd.—From all I can learn, sabbath-breaking and other sins were regarded in this church, very much as stealing was among the Spartans. The act itself was not so bad, the only crime was in being found out.

At a later day, and under my own observation, the following case of discipline occurred in the same church. Mr. S., a respectable farmer, and one of the most upright, conscientious members of the church, was present at a public dinner, given in honor of the celebration of peace between this country and Great Britain in 1815. The occasion was a joyful one, and the people manifested their joy, as is generally done at such times, by free eating and drinking. *The pure juice of the grape*, had not then come in fashion, and all the wine drank in honor of that event, "horribile dictu!" was the product of a New-York distillery. Mr. S. drank—he felt as if he was bound to drink; especially when every body else around him was drinking, from Parson C. down to Deacon Y.: and though he was not in the habit of taking any thing stronger than cider, he thought he could not sufficiently honor the day, if he did not swallow *quantum suf. of wine.* At length "his head began to feel very curious, and his stomach queerer yet," to use his own words; and he set out in his wagon for home. His neighbor, Mr. H., who had not been on good terms with Mr. S. for several years, and who was now on the "*mutual watch*" system, followed close behind. Not a motion of Mr. S. escaped him, and long before Mr. S. had reached home, Mr. H. was ready to swear that he was intoxicated. No one else saw him in this situation, and he was universally known to be one of the most temperate men in the town. But Mr. H. was convinced he had taken too much, and Mr. S. was willing himself to acknowledge, that what he had drunk made him feel unpleasantly, and was the cause of his returning home so early, but denied that he was intoxicated. Mr. H., the *aggrieved brother*, lost no time in lodging a complaint against Mr. S. in the church, accusing him of intemperance, and calling for a meeting to try him. It has already been seen that a complaint against a member of a Congregational church, bars him from the communion, and deprives him of his privileges even before trial. Meeting after meeting was held for the trial of Mr. S: his character was slandered, his feelings lacerated, his large and respectable family treated with neglect and even insult; and all to gratify a malicious and persecuting neighbor. H., from his influence, having married the deacon's daughter, and being *brother to a minister*, prosecuted the business with untiring zeal and bitterness,—he not only visited and talked with every male member of the church, but he also gossipped with the females, and endeavored to enlist their influence against a man, who was in point of character and real worth, far his superior. So far was the matter carried, that a division of the church was threatened, unless Mr. S. should be required to read a public confession before the whole congregation, acknowledging himself guilty of the crime of intemperance—a bare majority at length voted to this effect. But Mr. S. was too much of a man to be thus trod upon: he refused to confess before the world that he had done wrong, as they were not the party offended; to the *church* he was willing to confess that he had "erred, and been imprudent;" but this was not sufficient. Mr. H. was bent on inflicting a more public disgrace, and the result was that Mr. S. was excommunicated. In a New-England village this is equivalent to having spent five years in the State Prison; accordingly Mr. S. sold his farm and moved away to the West. Since that time several other cases of discipline have resulted from the "watching" of Mr. H., all going to show the peculiar excellences of the plan of "*mutual watch.*" C.

For the Churchman.

Mr. Editor,—I perceive that your correspondent Φιλαρχαιος is a disciple of Coleridge, and therefore I am disposed, with you, to hope that he will do well. This will not be, however, until he shall have joined with his skepticism, caution. He doubts wisely, but asserts rashly. I can hardly persuade myself not to think of him as a young student of history, who has got as far as the year 1527, in Hume, and gives us the result of his ponderings—not worthless, by any means, but based on an amazingly slight foundation. Surely, Sir, one familiar with Luther and his times could not have swallowed Hume's foul slander, which Luther's own coeval dared not promulgate,—that envy of the Dominicans prompted the bold Augustinian monk! Surely, one conversant with English martyrology would not talk of "Lollard" as an individual opponent of Rome! Surely, one acquainted more than by report, with Wiclif's writings, would not coolly, or rather most rashly, set down the Rector of Lutterworth as a *heretic!* I say nothing of his "Adrian XVI."—for your printer *may* have inserted the decimal numeral where it ought not to have been.

From what, Sir, does your correspondent consider Luther to have made a schism? or *in* what? He does not clearly state: but a slip of the pen seems to indicate what I would fain disbelieve of any of your correspondents—a willingness to allow the most impudently usurped claim of the bishop of Rome to a headship in the Church catholic. "A reformation of the Church," says he, "commenced and carried through *by its head*, was rational and right." Was Adrian, poor, weak, impotent, murdered Adrian, *the head* of "the body" which has one faith, one baptism, and one spirit?" Was he, whom his own cardinal priests and deacons hated and despised, to wipe off the foul blot with which the filth of ages had defiled the face of the spouse of Christ? and that by his authoritative procedure? Perhaps, Sir, Φιλαρχαιος has met with the writings of Erasmus—a wise man, and a prudent, in his way—or at least with his life by Tortin. If so, he knows what Erasmus thought of Adrian and his reformation—that was to be. He strove for such a blessed change as would have come over the face of things when a pope began to do more than *talk* about reformation, and he prayed for it,—but he did not *hope* for it. He too well knew the mystery of iniquity that was working on the seven hills, to indulge a delusive hope that thence there could issue forth aught of purity or truth.

But, Sir, was the man that wore the triple crown, then owned as head by the Church catholic? Did the Churches of the East, that ancient, and, even in its ruins, goodly Church of Greece, with her sisters beyond the Euphrates, did they own his sway? The venerable relic of Christianity as it was before it had been placed on the throne of the Cesars, the Churches of Abyssinia and of Malabar, did they acknowledge him? Take the map of the world, and measure out the little space in which a collective body of Christians looked toward Rome as the centre of unity and apostolic tradition, and then cast an eye over the remainder of the world through which the Greek, and Russian, and Syriac, and Chaldean, and Ethiopic, and Indian branches of Christ's Church were spread, and then say what I am to think of the reasoner who assumes Rome's headship as the basis of a charge of schism against the Reformer!

I the more regret this extraordinary carelessness in your correspondent, Sir, because I believe him to be right in his result, though strangely erratic in his way of arriving at it. Luther might have burned the pope's bull, and yet have been no schismatic. But he suffered himself to be drawn on till he took steps which did place him in schism from the Church Catholic; assuming that which Aaron and his great antitype did not take upon themselves—a power to give commission in God's name to do the work of God, without authority for that purpose received of God. Luther might have called the pope *Antichrist*, and Rome the whore of Babylon, and yet have been no heretic. Men who lived and died in the communion of Rome had done so before him, with impunity, nay, with praise. But Luther and his followers neglected Paul's advice, to "take heed to the doctrine," when they suffered their enmity of Rome to make them hate and reject wholesome verities, because incrusted with Romish corruptions, and even mutilate the word of God,* to get rid of its opposition to their crudities. Yet why take Luther to task so roundly for these errors? Luther did not love schism for its own sake, nor hug heresy because it looked so unlike the creed of Rome. But we know where to find those who did. And *there*, Mr. Editor, we shall lay our finger on a worse plague-spot than broke out in Saxony. Luther and his colleagues were guilty of *neglecting* antiquity—of allowing the din of battle to deafen them to the voice of God's providence, witnessing *to* and *for* his word, within his Church, through fifteen centuries. But it was reserved for French audacity to teach them to scoff at it, and count it a vain thing. Never has the current of pure religion run smoothly since men, calling themselves the reformed, *par eminence*, strove to stop its channel, and hew out for themselves cisterns, broken cisterns, that could hold no water. They had invented a system of doctrine and of polity which the voice of the Church condemned. Their resource was to stifle or to cry down that voice. God be thanked, they could do neither—but it was not their fault. The Lutherans, under Melancthon, would never have given in to their traitorous design. But when his gentle, elevated, far-seeing spirit had winged its way to the Church above, the Lutherans learned to swear by the word of their first great Apollo only, and on his authority to set aside that of antiquity. Every one knows what has been their course, and that of the Calvinists, since then. The strife seems to have been, who should run fastest and farthest in the race of innovation and declension. Far enough, indeed, they have pursued their mad career—to the very confines of infidelity! The Lutherans, at least, have felt their danger, and begin to see their error, and retrace their steps. And do what? return to the usurping "head" of a Church nominally "catholic," but really self-severed from the communion of the great body of Christ's Church? No! but "seek the old paths," and clean out the weed-grown channels of the living waters, and ask the Church of God, which in transmitting to us the word, is the "ground of the truth," for that interpretation by which she becomes oalso its "pillar."

I have more to say on the subject, Mr. Editor, but I see I am growing tedious. The theme is too seductive. Would that its riches were more generally appreciated! M. N.

* Luther is well known to have denied the authenticity of the Epistle of James, because it makes good works a necessary evidence of faith.

For the Churchman.

Mr. Editor,—It appears to me that a fundamental error runs through both the attack and defence that have recently appeared in your columns, of the Standing Committee of this Diocese in relation to their late proceedings touching the Diocese of Michigan. The committee being by canon a co-ordinate source of jurisdiction in this matter, the only true question is, Did they, in their recent act, go beyond their *constitutional* limits? Did they assume any powers or exercise any discretion which the canon under which they acted had not placed expressly and explicitly in their hands? So far as they are concerned, this is certainly the only true question, and their sufficient justification lies, not in maintaining the conclusion to which they came, but in showing that the discretion which they exercised was precisely that discretion which the wisdom of the Church, in its united councils, had solemnly intrusted them with, to be by them freely used, viz. that of saying whether they would consent or would not consent to the consecration of a bishop under that canon when called upon by the bishops to make that election. Now, to go beyond this, and to call them to account for the grounds of their decision, or the manner in which they have exercised their constitutional discretion, is obviously to sit in judgment, not upon them, but upon the canon under which they acted, and the authority by which that canon was passed. Upon whom, for instance, does the censure of their oppugners rest when they charge upon the committee *assumption* and *arrogance* for undertaking to review the acts of the bishops—to differ from them in their interpretation of the canon, or to express a doubt of the expediency of the individual whom a majority of the bishops had concurred in choosing. Now, I pray you, upon whom does this censure rest? Is it upon the committee, or upon those who made the canon? Unquestionably upon the latter—for the canon presupposes every one of these points which are thus made the ground of their condemnation; since the question cannot come before the Standing Committee before the majority of the bishops (in one way or other) have decided in favor, both of the act of consecration and of the individual to be consecrated: so that if the committee refuse their consent at all, which the canon supposes they may do, and which unquestionably they are as free to do as to grant it, (otherwise the canon itself is a farce and a nullity,) then it must be done against the known and recorded opinion of the majority of the bishops; and if not a mere act of caprice on the part of the committee, such refusal must be founded upon a different interpretation of the canon from that of the bishops, or a different opinion as to the expediency of the individual chosen. Such censures, therefore, are maligning, by their argument, that very body whose authority they are most anxious to maintain; since without the consent of the House of Bishops such canon could not have passed.

But it seems there are two further points of condemnation—the committee have given reasons for their refusal, and have made them public. Now, the first of these was obviously an act of courtesy. To refuse consent without rea-

sons assigned, is always regarded as the act of a superior, and is universally felt to have in it somewhat of the arrogance of irresponsible power. Thus in royal governments the king *vetos* arbitrarily and without reasons—while in our more democratic constitution, the president must give the grounds for his refusal, so as to stand not upon power, but upon reason. In the case before us, the canon being silent as to manner, either course was constitutional; but the committee felt, and justly felt it, to be most courteous toward the bishops to render their reasons, and therefore did so. And as to publication (setting aside the fact that the committee having taken no order upon it, the charge cannot rest upon them) the sufficient answer is, that where secrecy in legislation is not enjoined, publicity is presumed, and that, in the corresponding case of the testimonials of the bishop elect being given by the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies,—for which testimonial the approbation of the standing committees is, in this case, the substitute,—in *that* case, publicity necessarily belongs to the whole proceeding, from the fact of the sittings of that body being open and public.

Such are the considerations, Mr. Editor, which to my mind exonerate the committee from all charge. They have done simply what the canon required them to do—to answer the call made upon them without fear or favor. If, in the exercise of this high responsibility, they have failed in sincerity, they are answerable to God and their consciences—if they have failed in judgment, they are answerable to their own Convention, whom they represent, and by whom they are annually appointed: but in neither case are they answerable or amenable to the reading or the writing public—or rather I would say, to that nameless, headless, irresponsible tribunal, which in the present day, under the name of PUBLIC OPINION, threatens to swallow up or break down all that the wisdom of our forefathers has contrived in the constitution of either Church or State as checks against its vagrant unauthorized influence. Let me recommend, even you, Mr. Editor, to look at this matter more seriously in this point of view. Is there any tyranny, I would ask you, of which in the present day we stand in such danger as of the popular press? You may say it represents the public mind; I answer, it does not represent it until it has formed it; and there lies the danger: for the question is, Who are the nameless writers, who, with their ready pens, fill its columns, and thus work up and mould the public mind? Who will warrant for them that they are all wise, prudent, and sage, and experienced,—qualities which I admit gives, as it were, a natural right to govern? No Sir, we know nothing of them, and can know nothing of them, and yet in the mean time with their pens they govern and control all things; they call themselves public opinion, and by degrees make public opinion, until at length all regular authority stands abashed before them.—Constitutional checks lose their influence, and they who are to apply them are either scared from their fidelity, or, in the exercise of their rightful powerrs, are branded as assuming a tyrannical dictation over their equals. Now, Sir, this is *tyranny;* and such is its history in all modern times. Whether it be the Jacobins in the legislative halls of Paris, browbeating the members into the passage of such laws as pleased them, or the anonymous writers of a popular press, putting upon their trial a standing committee of the Church in America, in an act of unquestioned constitutional discretion, it is the same spirit, and nourished by the same passions; and so far as it is successful among us, will be attended with the same result,—that of prostrating the constitutional securities which the age, and wisdom, and piety of our Church have established in the agency of official responsible agents, established before the existence of a power, which knows no limit, recognises no rule, and acknowledges no responsibility. V.

THE CHURCHMAN.

SATURDAY, MAY 28, 1836.

TERMS,

Two dollars and fifty cents, if paid in advance, or three dollars if at the end of the year.

THE TRINITY.—Aristotle, and some of the wisest heathen philosophers, taught the eternity of matter. Why? Because they believed that the perpetual emanation of power, and love, and other perfections, was essential to the divine nature. They could not conceive of God, except as an energetic creative being, eternally happy in the contemplation of his own works. Thence they argued that the creation must be coeternal with the Deity. Thus they denied the existence of God independent of matter.

Professor Stuart, and other wise Christian divines, disbelieve the eternal generation of the Son of God. Why? They say, indeed, that they cannot find the doctrine in Scripture, but as the catholic Church in all ages *has* found it there, we may well take the stronger reason to be, because they think eternal generation is ******* nonsense. If a substance be derived, there must have been a time, they argue, when the derivation commenced. They, therefore, *can* conceive of the Deity as existing in a quiescent state; they do not think it necessary to believe that his energies have been put forth from eternity. Hence they deny that God has eternally existed, FATHER, SON, and HOLY GHOST.

Now, which have thought the most reasonably, the Heathen sages or the Christian divines? Which, reason being the umpire, have formed the most worthy conceptions of God? Beyond a doubt, in our judgment, the Heathens.

We confess we cannot conceive of God, except as possessed of an eternal principle of communicative goodness. Love and benevolence are perfections of the divine nature. But who can conceive of love and benevolence without an object on which to flow and expend themselves? What are these principles of love and benevolence but that complacency or satisfaction which the Supreme Being finds in an object or person distinct from himself? Love, when there is nothing to be loved; benevolence, with nothing toward which to be benevolent, are self-contradictions and impossible. If, then, the Deity be a simple essence, in which there is no such distinction as Father and Son, we see not how to avoid the inference that the Deity must have for ever possessed *in the creation* an object of love and benevolence, and consequently that the creation is coeternal with Deity. Moreover, these perfections of God, his love and benevolence, are infinite as well as eternal, and they need an infinite object: if that object be the universe, then the universe must be infinite as well as eternal. Further, if the creation be a work of time, and if there were no previous adequate object of the divine love, it follows that the Deity, at the time of the creation, received a new accession to the perfection of his nature, which is an impeachment of the immutability and perfect happiness of his nature, and absurd; and therefore, again, the creation must have been eternal. In short, so far as we can see, if there be no such distinctions as Father and Son, eternally existing in the divine essence, God and matter are one and inseparable, the Pantheist is right, and the Deity is nothing more than the *animus mundi.*

But admit the distinction of Father and Son eternally existing in the Godhead, and these difficulties vanish. The Father, the fountain of Deity, has then an object capable of receiving the infinite communications of his love, and of partaking with him the whole fulness of his unchangeable bliss and glory. The creation, as we Christians believe, is finite, and a work of time, and therefore cannot fully receive the infinite and eternal communications of the goodness of God, or be an adequate object of his love and complacency. The happiness of God, therefore, would be finite, would depend on his creatures, would exist only in time, if he had not in his own nature a person capable of receiving the perpetual efflux of his divine perfections. This person revelation discloses as the eternal Son, defined by the best expositor of God's word, the primitive Church, to be "God of God, very God of very God." It declares the Son to be a distinct person from the Father in unity of essence; the image of the Father's person, and the everlasting object of his complacency. No creature can supply this demand of the divine nature. The creation itself, in the Christian view, is an act of arbitrary choice, and not produced by necessity of nature. But we conceive of God as a being who is happy by the necessity of his nature; who was infinitely happy before he became a creator, and would have so continued if creation had never existed. Now if we believe the Son to be begotten in eternity, not made in time,—i. e. derived from the Father by necessity of nature,—then we do conceive of God as happy in his own nature, eternally and necessarily happy as the FATHER, with the love and complacency inseparable from the contemplation of the Son. But if we deny the eternally-begotten Son, we rob God of his paternity, which comprehends the necessary perfections of his being So true is it, "he that denieth the Son, hath not the Father."

But the Deity, it may be said, is happy from all eternity in the contemplation of his own perfections. True: and what is the revelation of a trinity of persons in unity of essence but a manifestation of the mode in which the Deity contemplates his own perfections? The happiness of God is not the meditative, introversive act of an anchorite: it is that of the Father eternally beholding the express image of his nature reflected in the Son.

One thing we think clear, which is, that if the Stagyrite had been blessed with the Bible, he would not have made such an exhibition of reasoning as the acute Mr. Stuart, the eloquent Dr. Channing, or honest Adam Clark. His sagacious mind had approached, as nearly as a human mind without the light of revelation could approach, the sublime conception of the eternal Son, the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his person. His reason taught him that the perfections of God could not be quiescent or introversive, but must be energetic and communicative. With this conviction he was prepared to embrace the manifestation of the infinite and eternal SON, the adequate object of the FATHER's love. But, alas! human reason in its best estate is perfect weakness, and ascends its highest pinnacle only to fall into the deepest abyss. Aristotle saw the want, so to speak, of the divine nature, but knew not the only-begotten of the Father, who receives of the fulness of the Godhead, and in whom that fulness dwelleth bodily. He was driven, therefore, to look to the creation to supply this want, and thence, with a mixture of majesty and weakness, that makes us hesitate whether most to admire his boldness or despise his folly, declared, The creation is infinite, is eternal; the material universe is the brightness and image of the Father's glory; matter, in a word, is coeternal and coinfinite with God. Thus while reason forms its loftiest conception of the Deity, it, in effect, denies his existence. What Christian, then, that contemplates this, will not pray, "Almighty and everlasting God, who hast given unto us, thy servants, grace, by the confession of a true faith, to acknowledge the glory of the eternal Trinity, and in the power of the divine Majesty to worship the Unity; we beseech thee that thou wouldest keep us steadfast in this faith, and evermore defend us from all adversities, who livest and reignest, one God, world without end. Amen."

BAPTISM SUPERSEDED.—The report from the Committee on Revivals, which by rule was laid on the table yesterday, was then taken up. The first alteration proposed was a trifling one in the rule respecting the admission of members into the Church. Rev. Mr. Agard, of Oneida, moved an amendment to the rule, by adding to it, "and have been baptized," so that the rule, after being altered as proposed by the report, and amended by the motion, would read, "Let none be received into the Church until they are recommended by a leader with whom they have met at least six months on trial, and have been baptized." It appears that no explicit rule, requiring persons to be baptized before admission into the Church, had ever existed in the book of discipline. The preachers, however, did consider such a rule as existing by implication, and their general practice was to admit none except they were baptized. The vagueness, however, of the discipline on the subject was taken advantage of by many, and in accommodation to the sentiments of the Friends, and other circumstances, many had been admitted into the Church without baptism. This was particularly the case in Baltimore, and some sections in the more southerly parts of the States. The evil had become somewhat alarming, and called for a speedy remedy. An animated and interesting debate ensued on the motion of Mr. Agard to amend, in which many of the most able members took part. It was almost universally agreed that the principle involved in the proposed amendment was a correct and important one, and should generally be acted upon, but some doubted the expediency of having an explicit rule on the subject, as they supposed there might be cases in which it would be necessary to deviate in practice from the principle. They thought it should be left discretionary with those who had charge of circuits and stations. It was contended by others that baptism was an ordinance of CHRIST, and that the discipline recognised it as a sacrament, and consequently no one whose duty it was to administer discipline had a right to dispense with it. An instance was stated in which a person had been received into the Church, licensed to preach, and presented for ordination, without baptism; but on the fact being ascertained, he was required to be baptized before he was ordained. The amendment was carried by a large majority. This alteration, or improvement, is considered a matter of very great importance by those who were favorable to it. Some of them remarked that it was worth the labor and expense of the whole session; and it appears to me to be a triumph of evangelical principle over that looseness and vagueness which is so prevalent in the Christian world, and which at the present time is evidently undermining the very foundation of vital and practical godliness. Such a triumph in every branch of the Church of CHRIST should afford matter of joy to all evangelical Christians.

Remarks.—A correspondent of the New-York Evangelist, in narrating the proceedings of the Methodist General Conference, which has recently convened at Cincinnati, gives the above account of an amendment of one of the laws of their Society. We have thought it worth transferring to our columns, as an illustration of the general disposition to underrate the sacrament of baptism, and of the folly and danger which may result from making temporary expediency a rule of legislation. It would seem, from the above statement, that the Methodist Church presents the singular anomaly of having members of their own Church in full communion, whom they themselves cannot pretend to be, in any other than a moral sense, members of the Church of CHRIST. And yet, glaring as the evil was, a party was ready to advocate its continuance on the ground of expediency! If the evil had been suffered to increase, of course the expediency of retaining it would have increased in proportion; and, after a while, it would have been too late to apply the remedy; and thus, in the potent alembic of expediency, error would have been commuted into truth, right into wrong. In the present case it was decided by a large majority, that baptism should be made obligatory, and that henceforward no unbaptized person shall be a member of the Methodist Church. A parallel case, however, might be laid before the General Conference, in which, we fear, the "large majority" would shrink from the consistent application of their principles. The case on which they legislated respected a number of Christians, who took upon themselves the rights and privileges of *members* of the Church, without having received baptism. The case which we would put, would be that of a number of Christians who took upon themselves the rights and privileges of *ministers* of the Church, without having received ordination. If expediency and the supposed exigency of the case did not supply the want of baptism or justify its continued neglect, ought expediency, the exigency of the case, or any similar considerations, be regarded as supplying the want of a valid ordination, or justifying the continued neglect of it when it may be had?

It is scarcely less instructive to see the inconsistency of the writer above quoted, considering it as a specimen (and such it actually is) of the loose and inconsistent habit of thinking, which generally prevails in our country, in regard to the positive institutions of the Christian Church. In the outset of his remarks, when his mind was fixed on the ordinance itself, the writer speaks of the amendment as a "trifling alteration." In the conclusion, when he had wrought his mind into the views which were probably brought out in the course of the debate, and was impressed with a sense of the ruinous consequences which would ensue from suffering such laxity to go unchecked, he says, "*it* [the amendment] *appears to me to be a triumph of evangelical principle over that looseness and vagueness which is so prevalent in the Christian world; and which, at the present time, is evidently undermining the very foundation of vital and practical godliness.*" Thus it is when men look upon baptism in itself, and see a simple and apparently unimportant rite they are inclined to despise it, and think no good can result from observing it; and it is only when they look about in the community, and see the disastrous consequences both to practical and doctrinal religion which flow from its general rejection, that they are able to appreciate it. We make no mystery of baptism; we do not believe it to be the means of regeneration in the moral sense of the term, nor are we inclined to deny that evil may have resulted from investing it with an adventitious importance not contemplated in its primitive institution. But on the other hand, we believe that it *is* a divine institution; from the fact of its divine institution we argue its expediency, believing that the Founder of the Christian religion knew what was expedient to preserve its purity and insure its perpetuity far better than any of his followers. And while we aim, in the spirit of faith, to comply with the requirement, we see in "the looseness and vagueness which are so prevalent in the Christian world, and which, at the present time, are evidently undermining the very foundation of vital and practical godliness," abundant proofs of its utility. And if we admit that an overvaluing of the ordinance has been productive of evil, we have also evidence that the undervaluing of it has been equally deleterious. It is the disparagement of the rights and privileges conferred in baptism, and the substitution of the Lord's supper in its place, as the badge of Church membership, that have led extensively to the neglect of early religious education, and been largely instrumental in producing the popular excitements and doctrinal disputes which now agitate the Presbyterian and Congregational churches.

A System of Moral Philosophy, or Christian Ethics. By the REV. WILLIAM B LACEY, D. D., Principal of the Western Female Collegiate Institute, Erin Hill, near Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Pittsburgh: published by D. M. Hogan, 78 Wood-street. Philadelphia: Hogan & Thompson. 1835.

This work, as the title-page informs us, is designed for the use of parents in their domestic instruction, advanced classes in Sunday schools, and literary institutes; and appears exceedingly well adapted to answer the purpose for which it is intended. It is not a theoretical or philosophical essay, but strictly a didactic book of the kind which a Christian parent or teacher would like to use for easy and practical instruction. Dr. Lacey has founded his instructions on a scriptural basis, and the first book of his treatise is a concise and forcible exhibition of the evidences of Christianity, and a vivid portraiture of the blighting influence of infidelity. The second book treats "of the nature, adaptations, and relations of human beings;" under which head the author gives an unostentatious, but lucid and able analysis of human nature; and in this and one of his concluding chapters has succeeded in comprising, in a short compass, the outlines and most important features of what ordinarily passes in schools for "moral philosophy." In this part of the work the subjects of a future life and moral accountability are made laudably prominent, and exhibited in the light of Scripture, and of the common sense of mankind. The third book treats "of the several duties which we owe to God, to our fellow-creatures, and to ourselves." Our duties to God are divided into *internal* and *external;* the former comprehending investigation of the will of God, belief of his *existence* and his *word,* repentance for past sins, and acquiescence in his providence and laws; the latter comprehending the duties of searching the word of God, of prayer, observance of the sabbath, the celebration of public worship, the reception of the sacraments, and efforts to extend the Gospel. The author has made his work as attractive as a didactic treatise can be expected to be, while at the same time he has shown no disposition to shrink from a full exposition of the word of God. Thus the belief of God is made to comprise a belief in the trinity of persons in unity of essence, the doctrine being clearly stated, and the scriptural evidence of its truth being briefly exhibited. In the same way we find the inefficacy of good works as a ground of justification exposed, in few, but convincing words; the great Protestant doctrine of justification by faith satisfactorily explained, and the danger of mixing it with human error explicitly guarded against. We are tempted here to make an extract, as well for a specimen of the work as for the important truth inculcated.

"Convinced of the impossibility of obtaining justification by the merit of good works, many seek it conjointly in the grace of God, and the performance of moral duties. Believing that God is merciful, they hope that after doing all they can do, he will do the rest; that notwithstanding the imperfectness of their past obedience, he will, considering the sincerity of their intentions, not be strict to mark their iniquities; but that, in the plenitude of goodness, he will blot them out Against this system of compromise, however, St. Paul directs his most powerful reprehensions. 'If,' says he, 'salvation be of grace, then it is no more of works; otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then it is no more grace; otherwise work is no more work.'

"How, then, the question recurs, can man be justified with God? St. Paul answers, 'A man is justified by faith, and not by works.' 'That by grace we are saved, through *faith;* and that not of ourselves, it is the gift of God.' And saith the Protestant Episcopal Church, 'We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour JESUS CHRIST, by *faith;* and not for our own works or deservings. Wherefore that we are justified by *faith only* is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort.'

"Faith, divested of the meretricious circumstances thrown around it by human ingenuity, consists, simply, in a firm, vigorous, and operative belief of what God is, and what he has done for us; or in other words, of his existence and determinations in regard to our race. Illustrative of the nature and progress of this principle, St. Paul exclaimed, 'O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from this body of death?' and then adds, 'I thank God, through JESUS CHRIST, our Lord.' He here indicated, in the first instance, his feelings, arising from a conviction of his guilt and condemnation; and then, his gratitude and joy in relying upon the riches of divine mercy in CHRIST JESUS. And these, precisely, are the feelings of every individual in believing with a heart unto righteousness. Under a conviction of his exposure to the terrors of divine wrath; of his utter inability to save himself; and of the infinite sufficiency of JESUS CHRIST, to save to the uttermost all who come to him by faith, he confides in him alone for the fulfilment of the law's demand, and exercises in his promises that affiance which is the 'substance of things hoped for, and the evidence of things not seen.' In virtue of this act he is justified from all things, from which he could not be justified by the law of Moses, or by the law of nature. God, of his *mere mercy,* pardons his past sins, and restores him to his favor, in consequence of having *believed* the *truth* as it is in CHRIST."—pp. 140, 141.

Among the external duties, that of prayer is admirably handled. One section is devoted to show that prayer consists, in the first instance, of *desire;* in the next, the student is taught, by scriptural authorities, that it consists not simply of desires, but also in the *offering up* of these desires to our heavenly Father. In the next, he is taught that the FATHER is the object to whom our prayers should be addressed. In the next, the scriptural limitation of this truth is concisely expressed.

"Addressing our prayers immediately to the SON and the HOLY GHOST, is, under certain circumstances, sanctioned by the Scriptures, and adopted by the Church; but this fact, instead of invalidating the statement we have made, seems to have been intended originally to establish the doctrine of the trinity; and this being done, our duty is, in ordinary cases, to address our prayers to the 'God and Father of our Lord JESUS CHRIST.'"—p. 164.

The author then shows that God *only* is the object of prayer, in such a way as to exclude saints, and angels, and all created beings, from a participation in the honor. The scriptural view of mediation, as the channel of prayer, is then developed, and the learner is introduced to the ONE MEDIATOR between God and man. The dispositions with which prayer should be made; the nature of the petitions of which it should consist; the advantages, the reasonablenes, and the various arguments for the duty, are then set forth in a suitable, didactic style, never interrupted by impertinent disquisitions or controversial digressions, though occasionally diversified with a strain of eloquence, as for example, in the following paragraph.

"But the most direct and powerful reason for praying always, and never fainting, is derived from the holy Scriptures. In them prayer is distinctly represented as a condition, on the performance of which the blessings of the new covenant are proffered. 'Ye have not,' saith the Apostle James, 'because ye ask not.' And Jeremiah says, 'Pour out thy fury upon the heathen that know thee not, and upon the families that call not on thy name.' 'Prayer,' says Bishop Taylor, 'is the effect and the exercise, the beginning and promoter, of all graces. A holy life is a continual prayer. Prayer is the peace of our spirit, the stillness of our thoughts, the rest of our cares, the calm of our tempest.' The flowing of the vital current through its destined channels is not more essential to life and health, than prayer is to the increase of grace in our hearts. In the neglect, or even in the remission of this duty, it is impossible to advance in virtue. The soul, in itself, is like the unsupported vine, which, instead of shooting upward, creeps on the ground, and exhausts its vigor in unavailing efforts to ascend; but when animated with the spirit of prayer, it is like the same vine fixing its adhesive tendrils to the sturdy oak, rising to its summit, and waving, uninjured, its verdant branches amid the blasts of the tempest, or the rays of the summer's sun. Nothing but fervent and unceasing prayer can bring us near to our heavenly Father; can penetrate the clouds which darken our distant prospects, and disclose to our weary eyes the Sun of Righteousness, shining in his cheering radiance."—p. 173.

The sabbatical institution and the duty of public worship are also treated in a very satisfactory manner: the discussion of the former, though given in the same unpretending style, being evidently the result of much reading and reflection on the moral, physical, and political benefits accruing from the institution. The part of the work which relates to the duty of receiving the sacraments, is marked by a skilful selection of appropriate topics, an avoidance of irrelevant and perplexing questions, and a condensation of matter of acknowledged correctness and utility. The exposition of the duty of extending the Gospel, embraces a view of the beneficial effects of Christianity on all the departments and relations of social life, compared with the deadening and demoralizing influence of Pagan and Deistical systems of ethics.

We have dwelt at some length on Dr. Lacey's work, because it is the most satisfactory attempt which we have yet seen, to give a system of moral science for the purpose of practical instruction fully and fairly founded upon the Scriptures. We are by no means of the opinion which has of late, to some extent, come in vogue, that the Scriptures are to supersede the necessity of a profound study and investigation of the principles of moral science, believing, as we firmly do, that a right philosophy is, and always will be, necessary as the substratum of moral and theological knowledge. But for every thing there is a time and a place; and it is most egregiously out of time and place, and a sinful waste of talents and opportunities, to be leading the majority of youth in our schools and academies, to pore over a treatise on the *philosophy* of morals, instead of teaching them the *science* of morals. The investigation of the former is adapted only to the few minds, and should be left either for private study or for the higher classes of a college. The knowledge of the latter is necessary to all, and should be made a fundamental branch of early popular education. To the former may be left the task of balancing the various theories of morals, and of showing their respective harmony or incongruity with Christian doctrine, but for the latter it ought not to admit of a doubt that the Scriptures, in a Christian community, should be the beginning, the middle, and the end. Until this is done, morals and religion will never be identified in the public mind, and men will never think that the belief and practice of Christianity is a part of their moral duty. A stranger to our race, just come to a knowledge of the fact, would regard it as one of the most inexplicable anomalies of our history, that while possessing a volume which we believe to be divinely inspired, and a pandect of moral truth, we should yet educate our youth in systems of "moral philosophy," in which the distinctive principles and duties of revelation were either faintly recognised or wholly surrendered; and would, perhaps, hardly believe us, if we should tell him that Dr. L.'s book is the first school treatise which we ever saw or heard of, that ranked justification by faith, and the reception of the sacraments, under the head of moral duties. But however anomalous, the fact is not wholly inexplicable. Many causes might be mentioned, of which it is sufficient to indicate one, and that is schism from the great body of the catholic Church. We have tacitly laid it down as a maxim, that nothing is to be taught *but what is admitted by all denominations,* which is in effect a virtual banishment of Christianity from our schools. This objection, we fear, will operate to exclude Dr. Lacey's book, though his treatise, in this respect, is as unexceptionable as any treatise can be which is worth having. We submit the question to all Christian parents and teachers: Ought not such an attempt as Dr. Lacey has made, to be encouraged? Ought not a book of this description to be adopted in every plan of Christian education? Whether instruction in Sunday schools is generally carried to the extent which the book contemplates we know not; if it is, we should suppose a better book than Dr. Lacey's could not be procured.

It would have been well, we think, if the author had introduced a middle class of divisions between the extended chapters and the short paragraphs—especially as his mode of treatment naturally requires it—and had entitled his book "A System of Moral Science," instead of "A System of Moral Philosophy."

Thoughts on the Religious State of the Country; with Reasons for preferring Episcopacy. By Rev. CALVIN COLTON. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1836.

(*Continued from page* 1078.)

IN our last extract, Mr. Colton had stated, as one of the deleterious results from the mode of admission to church membership practised in the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches, that it robbed the ministry of their primitive powers, and virtually nullified them as a separate order. He next traces the origin of this change to the same propensity which led Jack, in the allegory of the witty Dean Swift, after flying in a passion with his more moderate brother, who was quietly removing the tawdry ornaments from Peter's coat, rudely to seize the garment, and cut and tear it to shreds, "Because the Pope," says Mr. Colton, "and the fictitious hierarchy of which he was the head, had assumed too much power; the Reformation did not indeed dissolve the Christian ministry, but only rescued by scarcely saving it, and lodged it in some fragments of the Reformed Church. If Mr. Colton, however, here means to say that a majority, or even any considerable portion of the Reformers themselves were adverse to the ministry, considered as a distinct order, with peculiar powers derived by regular succession from the divine Founder of the Church, he does injustice, we apprehend, to the Reformation. The annihilation of the Christian ministry, and the substitution in its place of a body invested with no other rights than the factitious ones conferred by the will of a congregation, are no legitimate offspring of the Reformation: they are the fruit of a later age, and belong to the Independents of the time of Oliver Cromwell. It is to the Puritans, to the English dissenters, that we trace views derogatory to the Christian ministry, and not to any of the Reformers either in Great Britain or on the continent, who, although debarred by an alleged necessity from reforming with the episcopacy, ever held the Christian ministry in due respect as a separate and divinely constituted order.

But leaving the question of the origin of this state of things, we follow Mr. Colton to the description of it as it actually exists. He shows us that whatever deviations there may be in practice, the Congregational churches are yet organized on the *principle* that there is no ministry with powers derived from the Head of the Church: they regard their minister as one of themselves; as having no peculiar rights; as set apart by themselves to answer their own purposes: they require him in all his official acts to be amenable to themselves, and expect "to have and to hold him in their own power."

On this Mr. Colton remarks:

"Ministers who duly respect their office, ought, as seems to me, gravely to consider whether it is suitable to submit to this requirement. It has always been a clear point with me, since I have been in the ministry, that it is wrong, and that I could never comply with it. Although it might be said that the power here asserted by associations of laity over ministers is not often used, it is conceding too much—too much for honesty, if the principle is not in fact conceded; and too much in any case for the safety of a minister, as his church, in the event of an unreasonable opposition, would have it in their power to ruin him. The principle asserts and claims, in the mouth of the association—He (our pastor) is one of us, and our equal. We can judge, depose, and excommunicate him. It is very likely that this principle would not at present generally be interpreted in New-England as going to the extent of deposition; and that public opinion and the sympathy of pastors for each other, in connection with their influence, as men, would rescue a brother from such a doom. But still I think there can scarcely be a doubt that this practice originated in the full recognition of a principle having all this scope, and that such may still be its legitimate results, except by the barring of accidents.

"Ministers—if they believe in a ministry other than merely influential, and other than of lay origin—ought to take higher ground. It is due to themselves, to the cause, and to their Head. For myself, I have ever been accustomed to regard the Christian ministry as a distinct part of the constitution of the Church—as a separate grade, having powers inherent in itself, which cannot be invaded or impaired by lay influence; and to consider that the act of ordination, or consecration, lifts the subject into this condition, and invests him with its appropriate prerogatives. Thenceforward he is a member of his own body, that is, of the ministry, and amenable only to them. Of course, for a lay association to claim him as a member, and to assert power and control over him affecting his character and standing as a minister, is a usurpation. I do not deny that the laity may very properly have an agency and an influence in bringing an unworthy clergyman to trial for his delinquencies before the proper authority; but only that the laity cannot be his judges."

The comparative advantages and disadvantages resulting from a due recognition of the peculiar rights and character of the ministry on the one hand, and a denial of them on the other, are thus forcibly stated:—

"For the present I only propound for consideration the two following opposite theories:—First, that of the customary organization of Presbyterian and Congregational Churches, holding control over membership and the sacraments, with a consideration of the usual embarrassments and difficulties that attend it; such as a mode of admission, that cannot keep out the unworthy, even by the closest scrutiny; which excludes and repulses many that ought to come in; an organization which threatens; and often disturbs the peace of society, by authorizing every member to overlook the private conduct of his neighbor, in the covenant of mutual watch and care; which always finds it difficult to maintain tranquillity and order; which shakes the Church to its foundation by almost every case of discipline, and these not unfrequent, if the church be numerous; which cannot get rid of a bad member, disposed to make trouble, without in some instances threatening the existence of the body; which always has more or less of scandal resting upon it in the eyes of the world, and often not unjustly, and which for all these and many other reasons of the kind, is in the way of a blessing on the world around, rendering it at least problematical whether the evil it does is not greater than the good, in comparison of what might be accomplished, if this system were out of the way.

"Next, I would propose for consideration the other theory, that the ministry should be left in possession of its primitive and legitimate powers, viz. of dispensing the sacraments on their own official responsibility; that the pastor over any given congregation should 'preach the word,' 'be instant,' that is, ready for all pastoral emergencies, 'in season, and out of season;' that he should baptize at his own discretion, he being supposed to understand his duty in this particular, and conscientious; that he should admit persons to the holy communion also on his own discretion, having duly instructed and prepared them, and found them proper candidates; that it should be *his* duty to watch over the flock, 'to reprove, rebuke, and exhort,' and not *theirs* to overlook each other for these purposes, except as certain relations in life, such as parents, masters, guardians, intimate friends, and some others adventitious, might warrant, and render it safe and hopeful of good; and that he should instruct all, guide all, preside over all, so far as his proper ministerial and pastoral functions may be considered as legitimately extending. In this way the members of CHRIST's body sustain their visible connection with him *through* his ministers, and through them *alone*. All that other factitious machinery, so difficult to be kept in order, so hard to be worked to advantage, so prolific of discord and scandal, so detrimental to a pastor's influence and efficiency, and to a great extent a stumbling block to the world around, would be wanting. It could not be found, and consequently nobody could find fault with it. It could do no hurt positively or negatively. And yet all Christians could enjoy their privileges; CHRIST's Church and its ordinances would be open to them; the pastor could avail himself of all the helps to be found among his own people, to act under his advice and supervision, and not he under theirs; every mode of doing good, that is proper in any case, might be adopted in this, and every available talent among Christians put to use. The pastor might have his own adopted advisers, and consult them as he might feel the want of their counsel; but they should not be his governors. He might have a board to supervise and manage all needful secular concerns, as in other cases is provided for by statutes and ordinances of civil government.

"Now, set this theory down as opposed to the former, and let any sober and enlightened man say, under which of the two such a ministry as that which is generally found in the Presbyterian and Congregational connections, would be likely to accomplish the greatest good, under the same forms of worship now in use among them? Under which of the two would any good and faithful ministry be likely to do the greatest good, other things being equal? If the answer to this question be obvious—as I think it must be—and obviously in favor of the second theory proposed, the question is settled against the expediency of the first. The first is complicated, inconvenient, unnatural; it is not adapted to man as he is, nor to society as we find it; while the second is simple, practicable, and naturally works into society in all its forms. There is no possible good that can be done under the first, in given circumstances and by given agents, which may not be done under the second in the same circumstances and by the same agents; and under the second the grievous and necessary evils of the first may be avoided. And withal a scope is still left open, and a power still remains, under the latter, of extended usefulness, the amount of which cannot be estimated, all which the former for ever bars by its inherent defects.

"It is proper to remember, that these two theories are thus set forth in comparison, and supposed to be applied, where all other things, which are not necessarily inherent in the peculiar character of each, are equal; and it is in this view only that they can be properly appreciated."

Mr. Colton shows that many of the evils now agitating the religious world, arise from the neglect "to invest proper persons with responsible supervisory powers, to be exercised on settled and known principles. Take the following illustration:

"The Temperance Society, which, while it kept on its own proper basis, prospered so well and accomplished so much good, has more recently, as is well known, trespassed upon ground, the propriety of which is questioned by the great body of those persons who are decidedly the advocates of what they consider its legitimate design. This society has devised an ingenious method of enforcing its *ultra* pledges—particularly on ministers and other prominent characters—by sending copies of them by mail, and publishing in their journals the names of those who comply. As it is known that no clergyman or other prominent religious persons, who have 'a local habitation and a name,' are overlooked, those who do not comply are as effectually published as those who do, and consequently subjected to all the odium that can be brought to bear upon them on that account. It is not long since that a clergyman, a decided and strong temperance man, and occupying a highly important and influential post in the community, but unwilling, however, to comply with the *ultra* pledge, told me with chagrin and mortification, that having received a copy of it by mail 'from the Vatican at Albany,' he was *forced* into it as the least of two evils, inasmuch as he would be published if he did not comply, by *not being published*. His station and relations in the Christian community were such, that he could not get along comfortably without complying with this *order*—for such was its character and operation on himself. 'This,' he added, 'was tyranny with a witness!' It only shows how these public associations, when they get to be strong, and when urged on by the impetuous ultraisms of our country, may usurp and employ an illegitimate power."

But in every community where no provision is made for the delegation of responsible powers, irresponsible centres of influence will be established.

"Presbyterian and Congregational ministers must, will, and do have their leaders—self-appointed heads; heads who do every thing by the rule of their own heads. 'GOD sends us bishops, whether we will have them or not;' and the mischief is, when we refuse them, that they force themselves upon us under a system which often originates in their own whims; at best, a system of their own devising, and which changes with every new comer. It produces confusion; often creates disaster; especially when these leaders innovate on faith and practice, as is most strikingly illustrated in the present state of these two great denominations. Had these self-appointed bishops, or others of equal ability and more trustworthy, been clothed with the proper authority of bishops, duly respected in this office, held responsible for the conscientious discharge of their appropriate functions, under a system of regulations established in general convention, which they could not neglect or violate with impunity; and had they been well sustained in this office by public opinion, and by the hands of all their brethren, who, on this supposition, would have intrusted them with all these powers, it is reasonable to suppose that all these difficulties and painful results would have been avoided."

The author shows by a minute reference to the constitution and proceeding of the leading religious societies in our country, that the principle of episcopacy is virtually recognised by those who reject the institution. This ingenious and original view cannot well be abridged, and we have not room to insert it entire. The following reflections resulting from it are equally striking and correct:—

"It is a remarkable feature in the changes of society, that a community sometimes gets into a new state of the combination of its constituted elements before it is, as a whole, aware of it. Such eminently is the present condition of our country, religiously considered. It turns out that the episcopal principal is the pervading and ruling element of our whole religious public at this moment—the announcement of which, no doubt, will take many by surprise. But a single glance at facts will show that it is indeed so. The facts adduced in this chapter prove it, not to name any more. Turn our eyes which way we will over the wide country—more especially when we look at the great anniversaries of our religious and benevolent institutions at Boston, New-York, and Philadelphia—we find the entire religious population, including every denomination of importance, associated and organized into systematic bodies, supervised and controlled by a few individuals, and all based on the episcopal principle, and that in most cases in the most absolute and energetic form. There is now no escape from it—no treading back. If episcopacy is an evil, considered as a theory for practical use, we have left us only the *choice* of evils—to adopt its simple and proper form, as in the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, which is definite, palpable and responsible; or go on under the supervision and control of these extemporaneous institutions, which have grown up, as it were, in a night—which are the creatures of accident—which have been constantly shifting in their forms with circumstances—which are still liable to changes every year, and will doubtless experience them—the end of which no human foresight can predict—but which will be sure always to carry in them the element of power, naturally tending to the augmentation of its energies with the progress of time."

In the third chapter the author proceeds to the consideration of the liturgy. He shows conclusively that there must be forms, and *set* forms; that extemporaneous prayers, so called, are as much forms as written prayers; and tells us (and he is probably a competent witness) that any who doubt this might be convinced by "*a peep into the drawers*" of those ministers who are most "highly gifted" in prayer, that the gift was an *acquisition*, not an endowment; in short he says:

"Turn which way you will we are doomed to form, and a *set* form. Shall I say—blessed with it? And the only question is, whether we shall have a good or a bad one; whether it shall be well provided, uniform, and authorized; or whether, for the sake of now and then a rich treat, served out to a very few, the public generally shall be obliged to listen either to commonplace, crude, undigested form, recognised by every body from their earliest years; or to bold and startling novelties; and both, perhaps, for a great portion, offensive to good taste in the choice of language? Yes, in many cases, absolutely vulgar, tending to excite a very uncomfortable state of feeling, instead of promoting edification—becoming a mere matter of endurance on account of vices of this description. From form we cannot escape; that is settled by universal experience. The Presbyterian, the Congregationalist, the Methodist, the Baptist, all have their forms—their set forms: the Scriptures, if read, are a form; the hymns are a form; and as it turns out, the *prayers* are a form. It is a form from beginning to end—in the order and in the matter—except, perhaps, as recently and to a wide extent bold attempts have been made to break down all order and all form by the habitual introduction and rapid succession of startling and shocking novelties. These unprecedented innovations, instead of showing how good it is to be without form and without order, are fast bringing the minds of the public to their senses, and convincing them, if they were never convinced before, that some prescribed order and form are indispensable, not only to protect us from such innovations, but for comfort and edification. The extravagance and wildness of fanaticism have overrun the country; and the danger is, that the reaction, which is the unavoidable result of such a morbid excitement, will be a settling down of some into indifference toward religion; of others into disrespect and disgust; and of many into infidelity. Happy, indeed, if the net of the Episcopal Church should catch and save them; and to some extent no doubt it will. All these events will contribute providentially more than any thing else (thanks to GOD, who can bring good out of evil) to show the value of such a church—to illustrate its purity, the correctness of its doctrine, the stability secured by the happy combination of its elementary principles; and above all the benefit, the importance, the indispensableness of its forms and modes of worship in comparison with others.

"These unhappy occurrences will open the eyes of the people—of those who are not already borne away on the torrent and lost in the abyss. They will see that they have been deceived, innocently, perhaps, but yet deceived. For twenty years I myself have been deceived—willingly, I confess, under the influence of education, habit, and my religious connection; and it was these very events, in connection with the opposite extreme of *compelling* religious belief—the one throwing order into confusion, and the other generating bitter and endless strife—which opened my eyes, and brought me to a pause. I turned, and looked, and asked, where is a remedy for these evils? To oppose the wild career of extravagance on the one hand, was useless; and all the attempts to allay the bitterness and asperity of strife on the other, had proved before the world only the putting of oil upon fire. Happy for me, there was—happy for the community, there is—a medium between these extremes. Providence has brought in a remedy—not an extemporaneous one, but one of long standing and thorough proof; not an experiment, but a system, which has been the protection of the Church through ages of conflict and seas of trouble; which has redeemed her when plunged into idolatry and overwhelmed with superstition; which has rescued her from secular hands and secular control, when kings and civil magistrates have taken and employed her institutions and her priesthood for political ends; and which appears at last in the Episcopal Church of the United States, untrammelled by political bands, conscientiously eschewing all such connection, aloof from the *odium theologicum* on the one hand, and from the raging fires of fanaticism on the other—pursuing a straightforward, dignified, independent, harmonious career, respecting herself and commanding the respect of the world."

We here close our extracts from Mr. Colton. Those which we have given are not particularly distinguished from other parts of the work, but are fair specimens of the general interest and merit of the whole. Our chief aim has been to make our readers acquainted with the book, supposing that an introduction to it is all that is wanting to induce them to procure it and read it. We should like much to see the work extensively distributed: thousands would read it who would not read a more didactic treatise. None can read it without admiring the good temper, the enlarged information, the shrewd and philosophic spirit of the writer, and few, we think, without acquiescing in the correctness of his views.

THE CHRISTIAN LIBRARY.—The publication of this well-known work is still continued. It is a reprint, in a cheap form, of popular religious works, including some of great merit. In the course of ten years, at three dollars each year, the Christian Library would afford a collection of books, which, in the ordinary form, would cost, it is said, at least five hundred dollars. We wish the enterprise success.

Addresses on the Duties, Dangers, and Securities of Youth: with an introductory Essay by the Hon. Theodore Frelinghuysen. By A. EDDY, Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Newark, New-Jersey. New-York: published by Leavitt, Lord, & Co. Boston: Crocker and Brewster. 1836.

IF every place in our country were blessed with the influence of such a pastor as the author of these addresses, there would be little reason to dread the progress of infidelity. In a moral, intellectual, and religious point of view, the addresses are of a high character: sound in their general principles, and happy in the application of them to the various relations and circumstances of life; manly and impressive in their style, and especially adapted to guard the young against those evils which are most distinctively characteristic of the age.

CHURCH BUILDING SOCIETY.—This Society held its anniversary meeting at St. Thomas' Church, on Monday the 8th instant. The object of the Society is to raise a fund of $25,000, to be paid in annual instalments or otherwise, at the convenience of donors. The fund is to be under the direction of an executive committee, *to be loaned* to rising congregations in the West for the *sole* purpose of aiding them in the erection of churches. The loan is in no case to exceed $500, and to be advanced on condition that the congregation shall raise an equal sum or as much more as shall be sufficicient for erecting the church. In all cases, security will be exacted, and the whole amount is to be refunded to the Society in a given time, the first instalment on the debt to be paid at the end of two years from the time of the loan.

We consider the object of this Society as one of great importance, and are sorry to say that its anniversary meeting was not well attended. Had we been apprized of the meeting, we should have done what we could to excite an interest in its favor. One of the advantages of the Society will be to prevent many of the applications which are made to our citizens individually for assistance in building churches. These are already numerous, and will be likely to increase; and it is highly desirable that a systematic arrangement should be made to save our citizens from the inconvenience of special applications, and at the same time to accomplish the object on the most effective and economical plan. We are apt to think that such as are unwilling to turn a deaf ear to these applications, will find it to be their *cheapest* course to become subscribers to the Church Building Society. The constitution is well framed, so as to enable it to render its operations perpetual. Of the want of such aid, take the facts stated at the meeting as proof: In the State of Missouri there is *but one church;* in Illinois *but one completed;* and in Indiana *none*. On the other hand, it is well known that there are many places where missionaries are laboring, and desirous of means to erect churches; and many other places, inhabited in part by Episcopalians, which are every year lost to the Church, for want of churches and missionaries. In one town in Illinois, which has been in existence only five or six years, the collections in the Presbyterian and Baptist churches, on three successive Sundays, for missionary and other purposes, amounted to $2,500. So may it be with our churches, five or six yea rs hence, *if we can found them!*

CEMETERY AT BROOKLYN.—We are requested to direct attention to the cemetery of the new Episcopal church in Clinton Avenue, in the city of Brooklyn. The establishment of the South Ferry brings this church-yard within a mile and a half of the water. Convenient vaults are now building, and offered by the vestry on reasonable terms. The location is retired, beyond the reach of a dense population, and every way desirable for so sacred a purpose as depositing the remains of the dead. This is considered to be of the more importance, as it is thought that the public cemetery of this city will soon be removed to Ward's Island.

Is not New-York singularly unfortunate with respect to provisions of this nature? If the burial ground of St. John's Church, Hudson street, had been laid out with taste, it would have been an ornament to the city, and an allurement to sacred meditations. As it is, it is a confused an d unsightly heap of graves and stones.

NOTICE TO CORRESPONDENTS.—"Juridicus" and "Discussion" in our next.

"K." and "Laicus" are referred to the editorial articles, "Cemetery" and "Church-Building Society."

We are sorry to lose the "Address to a Son," but find it rather too long for our columns.

We have received two reviews of "A Walk about Zion," of which we shall take further notice in our next.

"B. C. A." we fear will not answer the purpose for which it is written.

"M. B." should have been acknowledged in our last.

INTELLIGENCE.

BISHOP ONDERDONK'S PROPOSED ORDER OF VISITATION FOR THE PRESENT SEASON.

Trinity Sunday, May 29, Geddes; 30, Onondago, West Hill; 31, Marcellus; June 1, Skaneateles; 2, Pompey; 3, Sherburne, 4 P. M.; 4, Norwich, consecration A. M., confirmation P. M.

First Sunday after Trinity, June 5, Oxford; 6, Greene, consecration A. M., confirmation P. M.; 7, ditto, ordination; 8, Coventry; 9, Bainbridge; 10, Fayetteville, consecration A. M., confirmation, P. M.; Festival of St. Barnabas the Apostle, 11, Huntsville, 10, A. M.; New-Berlin, 5 P. M.

Second Sunday after Trinity, June 12, Exeter; 13, Richfield; Wednesday, 15, Delhi, ordination A. M., confirmation P. M.; Friday, 17, Rensselaerville, Albany Co., ordination A. M., confirmation P. M.

Fourth Sunday after Trinity, June 26, St. Michael's Church, New-York.

Fifth Sunday after Trinity, July 3, Fort Hamilton, 5 P. M.; Wednesday, 6, Sing Sing, consecration A. M., cofirmation P. M.; 7, do., institution.

Sixth Sunday after Trinity, July 10, Trinity Chapel, Staten-Isand, 5 P. M.

Seventh Sunday after Trinity, July 17, Westchester, A. M.; Eastchester, P. M.; 18, New-Rochelle; 19, Mamaroneck; 20, White Plains; Friday, 22, North Salem, ordination A. M., confirmation P. M.

Eighth Sunday after Trinity, July 24, Fishkill Landing, ordination, A. M., confirmation P. M.; Tuesday, 26, Ballston Spa; 27, Saratoga Springs; 28, Sandyhill; Saturday, 30, Granville.

Ninth Sunday after Trinity, July 31, Hampton; August 1, Whitehall; Wednesday, 3, Plattsburg; Friday, 5, Malone.

Tenth Sunday after Trinity, August 7, Potsdam; 8, Norfolk; 9, Waddington; 10, Ogsdenburg; 11, Morristown, ordination A. M., confirmation P. M.; Saturday 13, Brownville.

Eleventh Sunday after Trinity, August 14, Watertown; 15, Sacket's Harbor; 16, Pierrepont Manor, consecration A. M., confirmation P. M.; 17, do., ordination; Friday, 19, Constableville, consecration A. M., confirmation P. M.

Twelfth Sunday after Trinity, August 21, Oswego; 22, Fulton; Festival of St. Bartholomew the Apostle, Wednesday, 24, Moravia; 25, Homer, ordination A. M., confirmation P. M.; 26, A. M. do. institution, 4 P. M., M'Lean; 27, Aurora, consecration A. M., confirmation P. M.

Thirteenth Sunday after Trinity, Aug. 28, Waterloo; 29, Canandaigua; 30, Allen's Hill; 31, Penfield; Sept. 1, St. Luke's Church, Rochester; 2, Avon; 3, Genesee.

Fourteenth Sunday after Trinity, September 4, Mount Morris; 5, Dansville; 6, Wethersfield; 7, Warsaw; 8, Sheldon, ordination A. M., confirmation P. M; 9, Le Roy, 5 P. M.; 10, Batavia, consecration A. M., confirmation P. M.

Fifteenth Sunday after Trinity, September 11, Darien; 12, Newstead; 13, Medina, consecration A. M, confirmation P. M.; 14, Grace Church, Lockport;* 15, Lewiston, A. M.; Niagara Falls, 4 P. M.; Saturday, 17, Fredonia, consecration A. M., confirmation P. M.

Sixteenth Sunday after Trinity, September 18, Mayville; 19, Jamestown; Festival of St. Matthew the Apostle, Wednesday, 21, Ellicottville, ordination A. M., confirmation P. M.; 22, Olean.

Seventeenth Sunday after Trinity, September 25, Bath, consecration A. M., confirmation P. M.; 26, Pen-Yann, consecration A. M., confirmation P. M.; 27, Hector, consecration A. M, confirmation P. M.; 28, Johnson's Settlement; Festival of St. Michael and all Angels, 29, Danby, consecration A. M., confirmation P. M.; 30, Candor, consecration A. M., confirmation P. M.; Oct. 1, Binghamton.

Eighteenth Sunday after Trinity, October 2, Harpersville.

Nineteenth Sunday after Trinity, October 9, St. James' Church, New-York; Wednesday, 12, Ulster, Ulster county, ordination A. M., confirmation P. M.; Friday, 14, St. Peter's Church, Albany.*

The Bishop has been unavoidably compelled, much to his regret, to omit a few parishes which have not been visited since 1833, and in which special Episcopal services are not required. He will, however, perform with pleasure, any services in addition to the above, which may be asked of him, provided they are not inconsistent with punctually discharging those appointed.

Where an ordination is to be held, the candidate is expected to see that the proper number of presbyters, two at least, is in attendance.

* Where there is more than one church in the same place, appointments for confirmation are made for the different churches in different years.

Alabama Convention.—We learn from the journal of the last Alabama Convention, which has been recently received, that its session was appointed to take place at Mobile on the 8th of February. A quorum not being present at that time, the Convention adjourned to meet at the same place on the 25th of March. A quorum was obtained on the 26th, and the Convention proceeded to business. The clergy present were the Rev. John Avery, D. D., who was elected president, the Rev. Samuel S. Lewis, and the Rev. Caleb S. Ives. The sermon before the Convention was preached by the Rev. Dr. Avery.

The following is the Report of the Standing Committee read to the Convention.

"The Standing Committee have to report the admission of four clergymen, presbyters, into this Diocese during the last year, viz. the Rev. John Avery, D. D., from the Diocese of North Carolina; the Rev. Andrew Matthews, from the Diocese of Tennessee; the Rev. William Johnson, and the Rev. Thomas A. Cook, both from the Diocese of South Carolina. There are now five officiating clergymen residing in the Diocese, the Rev. John Avery, D. D, of St. John's Church, in the Prairies, Greene county; the Rev. Andrew Matthews, of Christ Church, Tuscaloosa; the Rev. William Johnson, of St. James' Church, Montgomery; the Rev. Thomas A. Cook, of Florence, and the Rev. Samuel S. Lewis, of Christ Church, Mobile. The Rev. Caleb S. Ives resides in Mobile, and has charge of a female seminary.

"The Rev. Norman Pinney, of Mobile, has made application to the Right Rev. Thomas D. Brownell, D. D., LL. D., of the Diocese of Connecticut, who at present exercises episcopal jurisdiction over this Diocese, in pursuance of the seventh canon of the General Convention of 1832, to be displaced from the ministry of the Episcopal Church, by virtue of the thirty-eighth canon of 1832.*

SAMUEL S. LEWIS,
Secretary of the Standing Committee of the Diocese of Alabama.

"N. B. The Rev. Mr. Robertson, of the Diocese of North Carolina, and late a missionary of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, has, it is understood, removed from Huntsville, and resides in the country on a plantation, and it is not known whether he preaches regularly or not."

The Committee on the state of the Church represent its general condition as highly encouraging. The want of laborers is however deeply felt. Three organised parishes are now destitute of ministerial services, which are ready to support clergymen in whole or in part at once, and it is confidently believed that clergymen might be profitably employed in other situations if they could be procured.

The Committee recommend the establishment of a seminary for the education of boys, to be under the supervision of the Convention, and the formation of a diocesan society, auxiliary to the Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Union. A committee was appointed to report to the next Convention on the subject of the first resolution.

The following resolution in relation to the association, familiarly known as the South-western Diocese, was passed by the Convention:—

"*Resolved*, That in consequence of the repeal of the special canon of the General Convention of 1832, the South-western Diocese is thereby dissolved, and that the Secretary of this Convention be requested to communicate this resolution to the Diocese of Mississippi, and the clergy and churches of Louisiana."

From the report of the Committee on the establishment of the episcopacy and a bishop's fund, we make the following extract:—

"Your Committee, however, will not disguise the fact, that although the harvest be plenteous the laborers are few and scattered, and without the supervision of one residing among the flock to stimulate their zeal, and to concentrate their exertions. Indeed the Church in the Diocese is a body almost without a head—a head, if such it may be called, so distant as scarcely to direct its movements. We think that all Episcopalians perceive, and feel, and deplore the want of a bishop, and should one be appointed, we are confident that a support, meet and sufficient, would be most cheerfully accorded to him. We are, therefore, unanimously of opinion that a united effort should be made, not only by the brethren of our communion, but by all the friends and well-wishers of the Church, to attain this important object.

"It is in a spirit of thankfulness to the great Head of the Church, that we hail the commencement of the business. The propitious omen has dawned upon us from the East, and shall we not respond in like manner?

"Jacob Lorillard, Esq., of the city of New-York, stands pledged to bestow a section of six hundred and forty acres of land, lying in the county of Baldwin, in such manner and form as will most promote the welfare of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese. We recommend that the bountiful and Christian intention of Mr. Lorillard be effectuated in the commencement of a fund for the support of a bishop.

"The Committee, therefore, submit the following resolutions:—

"1st *Resolved*, That three trustees be appointed to receive from Jacob Lorillard, Esq., of the city of New-York, his land donation in a conveyance to them for the use and benefit of the fund for the support of a bishop for the Diocese of Alabama.

"2d. *Resolved*. That it shall be the duty of said trustees to solicit, by themselves and agents, funds by subscription or donation for the bishop's support in the Diocese, and when received be invested in the way deemed by them most advisable.

"3d. *Resolved*, That all funds obtained by virtue of the preceding resolution be under the control of the Convention of the Diocese of Alabama."

Episcopal Recorder.

* Our readers have already been informed that this has been done.—ED. REC.

NOTICE.

SPIRIT OF MISSIONS.—The Protestant Episcopal Press have undertaken the publication of the Spirit of Missions, by the appointment of the Special Committee of the Board of Missions on the missionary paper, and will receive subscriptions, *post paid*, at their office, 46 Lumber-street, New-York. The following agents have been appointed to receive subscriptions in different sections of the Union, viz. Rev. William Croswell, Boston; Robert Graffin, No. 12 Pear-street, Philadelphia; Joseph Gill, Richmond, Va.; and A. E. Miller, Charleston, S. C. The price of the Spirit of Missions is *one dollar* per annum; and *must, in all cases, be paid in advance*. tf.

NOTICE.

SUNDAY SCHOOL SOCIETY.

AT a meeting of the New-York Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Society, held on the 25th day of April, 1836, the following officers were duly elected:—

Right Rev. B. T. Onderdonk, President *ex-officio*.
Rev. J. F. Schroeder, 1st Vice President.
Rev. Lot Jones, 2d do. do.
Rev. A Smedes, 3d do. do.
Mr. Elijah Guion, 4th do. do.
Mr. T. C. Butler, 5th do. do.
Mr. W. R. Wadsworth, 6th do. do.
Mr. T. Wilber, Secretary.
E. Wenman, Esq., Treasurer.

By the fifth article of the constitution, the MANAGERS of the Society consist of the officers; of all clergymen having charge of Sunday schools in connection with the Society; of all superintendents of such schools; and of two delegates from each school, to be reported at the first meeting of the Board each year.

The schools are requested to report their delegates on Tuesday next, 31st instant, when a meeting of the MANAGERS will be held at the Sunday school room of St. John's Chapel, at eight o'clock, P. M.

By order,
T. WILBER, *Secretary*.

NOTICE.

AGENT OF THE SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION IN PHILADELPHIA.

AT a meeting of the Committee of Publication and Sales of the General Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Union, held on Monday evening last, Mr. Thomas Latimer was appointed agent for the publications of the Union in Philadelphia. Persons in that city or vicinity who wish to obtain any of the works of the Union, can be supplied by calling at the store of Mr. Latimer, in South Third street.

LOUIS SHERMAN,
Acting Business Agent, New-York.

Will the Episcopal Recorder please insert the above notice.

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

THE stated meeting of the Board of Trustees will be held in Trinity Church, in the city of New-York, on Monday the 27th day of June. Agreeably to the provisions of the Statutes, the Board will meet for business on the first day of its session, (the 27th,) at 6 o'clock P. M, and adjourn at 10 o'clock; on the second, third, and fourth days, at 5 o'clock P. M., and adjourn at 10; on the fifth day, at 1 o'clock P. M., or as soon thereafter as the exercises of the Commencement are closed; and also at 5 P. M., if necessary; provided, that in each case the Board may adjourn at an earlier hour, if its business be sooner accomplished.

The examination will begin at 9 A. M., on the second, third, and fourth days of the session of the Board, and close each day at half past 2 o'clock. The Commencement takes place on the fifth day at half past 9 A. M. By order, HENRY ANTHON,
Secretary of the Trustees.

The editors of the Church periodicals will please to insert the above notice in their respective papers.

New-York, May 28, 1836.

NOTICE.

THE annual meeting of the Board of Managers of th, General Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Union, wil be held at the Protestant Episcopal Press, 46 Lumber-st. Tuesday, June 21, 1836, at five o'clock, P. M. The annual sermon may be expected on the preceding Sunday evening.

Besides the persons elected managers, all other persons who have subscribed and paid one hundred dollars, or fifty dollars, are also managers, and are hereby respectfully requested to attend the meeting.

F. H. CUMING, Secretary.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

DOMESTIC MISSIONS.

THE Treasurer of the Domestic Committee of the Protestant Episcopal Missionary Society acknowledges the receipt of the following sums since his last report:—

Collection in St. Ann's Church, Lowell, Mass., on Sunday afternoon, the 15th instant, after sermon by the Rev. Mr. Dorr, $60 50—From the Sunday school of St. Thomas' Church, New-York, the yearly contribution toward the support of *Cornelius Francis*, an Indian boy at the Green Bay mission school, 30 00—From an Episcopalian of New-York, for general purposes, 10 00—From the "offerings" of St. John's Church, Salisbury, Conn., for Bishop Kemper, 6 75—Collection in St. Paul's Church, Sharon, Conn., at the Litchfield county meeting, for the same object, 7 25; both contributions by the hands of the Rev. Lucius M. Purdy, Rector of said parishes.

JAMES SWORDS, *Treasurer.*

May 25th, 1836.

GENERAL PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION.

THE subscriber, as Special Agent, &c., gratefully acknowledges the amount of the contribution on Sunday last, in Trinity Church, New-Rochelle, $50 00—St. Paul's, East-Chester, 77 75—Also, received of Rev. H. M. Mason, of Salem, N. J. in redemption of his pledge, 50 00—From D. Brunner, Esq., Baltimore, pledges collected by him, 60 50—From St. Andrew's Church, Philadelphia, redemption of pledges, 11 50—From Rev. S. C. Stratton, in redemption of his pledge, given at Philadelphia in August last, 50 00. Total amount, $299 75

F. H. CUMING.

SEMINARY LIBRARY.

RECEIVED from Mr. Herman Newbold one hundred dollars.
On part of Committee, J. MCVICKAR.

PRESS DEPOSITORY,

46 *Lumber-street.*

Letters have been received at the N. Y. Prot. Episcopal Press, during the week ending May 26th, from the following persons, viz.

Postmaster Georgetown—Rev. H. M. Davis—N. D. Haight, *with remit.*—Postmaster Smithland—Rev. J. L. Clark—Wm. Lloyd, *with remit.*—Robert Graffin—Postmaster Rome, N. Y.—Postmaster Lewes, Del.—Rev. W. Taitham—Joseph Gill—J. S. Rundlett, *with remit.*—Z. Clark—L. H. Young—John C. Pechin.

Received by the Gen. Prot. Episc. S. S. Union.

Rev. William Cogswell, *with remit.*—Postmaster Canandaigua—H. D. Evans, *with remit.*—Lt. A. Beckley, *with remit.*—Thomas Latimer—James D. Goodwin—Rev. N. E. Cornwall—Rev. A. Sanford—Joseph C. Crane, *with remit.*—Postmaster Ashtabula—E. Burr—Rev. Gilbert L. Wiggins, *with remit.*—T. Taylor—Rev. Isaac Smith, *with remit.*—A. E. Miller—Rev. S. C. Stratton, *with remit.*

TO BINDERS.

A good Finisher will find steady employ by calling at the office of the New-York Protestant Episcopal Press, 46 Lumber-street.

☞ Unexceptionable references will be required.

May 24, 1836. 1t.

SCHOOL FOR YOUNG LADIES,

NINTH AVENUE.

Near the Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary.

MRS. NEWTON and Daughters will continue their school at the above-mentioned place.

TERMS PER QUARTER.

Tuition, comprising Writing, Arithmetic, Grammar, Ancient and Modern Geography, Astronomy, History, Natural and Moral Philosophy, Chemistry, Botany, Mythology, Belles Lettres, and Embroidery,	$10 00
Ditto, including French,	16 00
English Tuition for the Junior Class,	8 00
Italian,	8 00
Drawing and Painting,	12 00
Piano,	15 00
Guitar,	10 00
Use of Piano,	1 00

TWELVE WEEKS IN A QUARTER.

The vacation during the month of August deducted. No allowance made for occasional absence.

REFERENCES.

Right Rev. Benjamin T. Onderdonk, Rev. W. Berrian, D. D., Rev. J. F. Schroeder, Rev. Professor Whittingham, of Theological Seminary, Rev. W. Powell, Rev. J. M. Forbes, Rev Samuel Seabury, Editor of the Churchman, Dr. V. Mott, Professor H. J. Anderson, of Columbia College, Professor L. L. Da Ponte, of Columbia College, D. A. Cushman, Esq., Floyd Smith, Esq., B B Howell, Esq., Charles Keeler, Esq., George Coggill, Esq., James Wallace, Esq.

God's Presence.

We consider persons as present, not only when they are within reach of our senses, but also when we are assured by any other means that they are within such a nearness. . . . . . . And must He, who is so much more intimately with us, that *in him we live, and move, and have our being,* be thought too distant to be the object of our affections?

Bishop Butler's Sermon on the Love of God.

When some loved friend is by,
And we sit silently;
That silence is not solitude;
All things put on a social mood.

When home, unseen, is near,
And fill'd with inmates dear,
Home thoughts are hanging on each tree,
And people the dun vacancy.

The day when Jesus rose,
Doth brighter skies disclose;
All things put on a sabbath ray,
The very birds keep holyday.

Did we feel at our side
The Friend who for us died,
The world with love would clothed be,
And wear a glad philosophy.

'T is prayer which gives to know
His nearness here below,
And opes anew a hidden door
Unto His presence evermore.

From Le Bas' Life of Laud.

ARCHBISHOP LAUD.

When Laud commenced his academic residence, Oxford bore a greater resemblance, in many respects, to a colony from Geneva, than to a seminary of Anglo-Catholic divinity. The genius of Calvin presided in the schools. The dark theory of predestination was maintained as an essential ingredient in the faith of a Christian man. The apostolic succession of bishops was treated as little better than a fable. The authority of the Church was scornfully disregarded. The very existence of a visible Church during the long period of Papal predominance was gravely questioned by some distinguished divines, while others maintained that it was to be sought for only in the scattered conventicles of Berengarians, or among the Albigenses, or the mountaineers of Piedmont, or perhaps among the Wiclifites of England, or the Hussites of Bohemia. In short, the whole life and virtue of religion appeared to be well-nigh concentrated into one thing,—an abrupt and impetuous departure from the Church of Rome.

Now the theological studies of Laud had taught him a very different lesson. They had been prosecuted in the spirit of the canon of 1571; which enjoined that the interpretation of Scripture should be regulated, not by a licentious exercise of private judgment, but by a strict regard to the doctrines which had been collected from Scripture by the primitive fathers of the Church. It was remarked by Dr. Young, by whom Laud had been ordained, that his studies had not been confined to the narrow and partial systems of Geneva; but that his scheme of divinity had been raised "upon the noble foundations of the fathers, the councils, and the ecclesiastical historians." And hence he pronounced that if the young man's life should be spared, he would become a fit instrument for the Church's deliverance from the trammels of every modern school, and for her restoration to the more free and comprehensive principles of the first and purest ages. The whole plan and elevation of doctrine which this course of inquiry had set before him, he found to be in strict conformity with the original scheme of the Anglican Reformation; but, in many essential respects, at mortal variance with the theory and the practice which then had got possession of the schools. And he was seized with a vehement desire to bring the Church of England from this state of defection back to her native principles.

It was not long before an opportunity was afforded for the manifestation of his *zeal*, his *forwardness*, and his *confidence*, in the cause of pure and primitive Christianity. Such was the estimation in which he was held as a scholar and a divine, that in 1602 he was admitted to read the lecture of Mrs. May's foundation, with the full consent and approbation of his college. And it was either in this, or some other academical exercise performed about the same time, that he resolved to stand forward in vindication of the articles and constitution of the Church. The adventure was one which, in times like those, demanded an intrepid resolution. But Laud had, doubtless, counted the cost of his warfare; and he accordingly maintained, in opposition to the predominant theology of the day, "the constant and perpetual visibility of the Church of Christ, derived from the apostles to the Church of Rome, and continued in that Church, as in others of the east and south, until the Reformation." By this exploit he marked himself out as an object of hatred to the Puritans, and more especially to their patron and champion Dr. George Abbott, master of University College, dean of Winchester, and in 1603 vice chancellor of the university. This divine, (who was afterward elevated to the primacy of all England,) was the foremost man among those who affirmed that it was impossible to discern the visibility of the Church, otherwise than by tracing it, through a straggling series of sects, from the days of Berengerius to those of Luther and of Calvin. These opinions he did not embody in writing till the year 1624; but they were notoriously entertained, and urgently contended for, by him at the time when the contrary position was taken up by Laud. There is too much reason to believe that Abbot never forgave this act of open resistance to the authority of his name. And it is most certain that from that moment to the end of his days, Laud was detested and pursued by the party of Abbot, as a confederate of Popery, and a sworn enemy to the Gospel of Christ."

From a Review of "Six Months of a Newfoundland Missionary's Journal, from February to August 1835."

TOUR OF ARCHDEACON WIX.

(*Concluded from p.* 1080.)

"*Friday*, 29. The next morning early I parted with my worthy friend Mr. J., who was obliged to return, as he was in hourly expectation of a brig in the Bay of Islands, direct from Jersey, in which the owners, who were his employers, wished him to proceed to the Labrador fishery. The superior demeanor of this person, compared with that of the people by whom he is surrounded, and his superior religious intelligence, were most gratifying. It may stimulate the exertions of those engaged in Sunday schools, to know that he attributes it himself to the attention which he received when a cabin boy, from a worthy clergyman in England. He was a native of Newfoundland, and received as fair an education as his highly respectable parents could themselves give him in a little out-harbor. He went home, however, when young, and while waiting for the sailing of his vessel, he was seen at church regularly on Sundays and weekly prayer days, in his sailor's clothes, in the pew of some English relatives in the port; the clergyman on observing this, noticed him, and took pains to give him instruction in his Sunday school, and on other occasions. He is now able to assemble a congregation, or to read by a sick bed, and has taught several of his nephews and nieces, and other neighbors to read, and he has told me that he knew he never could forget the kindness of that clergyman,—he trusted that he should never forget the advice which he had given him. How many grateful testimonies of this nature has it been my happiness to have had mentioned to me at different times in the last nine years, by the settlers in these distant colonies! The parish boy, or giddy girl, the impression or improvement of whose heart the village pastor has thought hopeless, as he presented the case in his private addresses to the throne of grace, has returned in a foreign land some portion of the obligation under which the kindness of the pastor of their youth has laid them to the Church, by entertaining and introducing into their neighborhood one of that missionary Church's missionary clergy; and, as after the dismissal of the settlement from his more public ministrations, confidence has been encouraged, and reserve has been removed; tales have been told of the village school and of the catechizing in the aisle of the church, and of the pastor's affectionate stroke upon the head of my host,—rugged and weather-beaten now,—but then a sleek curly-headed youth, and the reward book, with the pastor's valued autograph, has been brought forth, and the clasped Bible and the torn Prayer-book, which he would not by any means part with, but would wish for another,—till—O! the missionary and the man of rugged features have both become children! and on the thought of home, and of the churchyard stile, and the village spire, and the intervening sea, and the present sad, sad wilderness in which they are wandering, or wearing away life, far from the privileges of which such fondly recollected scenes remind them, they are both in tears, and both upon their knees praying for a blessing upon the dear Church of their fathers, that God would keep it with his perpetual mercy, cleanse it and defend it with his continual pity, and because it cannot continue in safety without his succor, preserve it for evermore by his help and goodness through Jesus Christ our Lord!"—pp. 178-181.

British Critic.

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH APOSTOLICAL.

There are many persons at the present day, who, from not having turned their minds to the subject, think they are Churchmen in the sense in which the early Christians were, merely because they are Episcopalians. The extent of their Churchmanship is, to consider that episcopacy is the best form of ecclesiastical polity; and again, that it originated with the apostles. I am far from implying, that to go thus far is nothing; or is not an evidence, (for it is,) of a reverent and sober temper of mind: still the view is defective. It is defective, because the expediency of a system, though a very cogent, is not the highest line of argument that may be taken in its defence: and because an opponent may deny the fact of the apostolicity of episcopacy, and so involve its maintainer in an argument. Doubtless the more clear and simple principle for a Churchman to hold, is that of a *ministerial succession;* which is undeniable as a fact, while it is most reasonable as a doctrine, and sufficiently countenanced in Scripture for its practical reception. Of this, episcopacy, i. e. *superintendence*, is but an accident; though, for the sake of conciseness, it is often spoken of by us as synonimous with it. It shall be the object of the following tract to insist upon this higher characteristic of our Church.

My position then is this;—that the apostles appointed successors to their ministerial office, and the latter in turn appointed others, and so on to the present day;—and further, that the apostles and their successors have in every age committed portions of their power and authority to others, who thus become their delegates, and in a measure their representatives, and are called priests and deacons. The result is an episcopal system, *because* of the practice of delegation; but we may conceive their keeping their powers altogether to themselves,—and in the same proportion in which this was done, would the Church polity cease to be episcopalian. We may conceive the order of apostolic vicars, (so to call it,) increased, till one of them was placed in every village, and took the office of parish priest. I do not say such a measure would be justifiable or pious;—doubtless it would be a departure from the rule of antiquity—but it is conceivable; and it is useful to conceive it, in order to form a clear notion of the essence of the Church system, and the defective state of those Christian societies which are separate from the Church catholic. It is a common answer made to those who are called High Churchmen, to say, that "if God had intended the *form* of church government to be of great consequence, he would have worded his will in this matter more clearly in Scripture." Now enough has already been said to show the irrelevancy of such a remark. We need not deny to the Church the abstract right, (however we may question the propriety,) of altering its own constitution. It is not merely *because* episcopacy is a *better or more scriptural form* than Presbyterianism, (true as this may be in itself,) that Episcopalians are right, and Presbyterians are wrong; but because the Presbyterian ministers have assumed a power which was never intrusted to them. They have presumed to exercise the power of ordination, and to perpetuate a succession of ministers, without having received a commission to do so. This is the plain fact that condemns them; and is a standing condemnation, from which they cannot escape, except by artifices of argument, which will serve equally to protect the self-authorized teacher of religion. If *they* may ordain without being sent to do so, *others* may teach and preach without being sent. They hold a middle position, which is untenable as destroying itself; for if Christians can do without bishops, (i. e. commissioned ordainers,) they may do without commissioned ministers, (i. e. the priests and deacons.) If an imposition of hands is necessary to convey one gift, why should it not be to convey another?

1. As to the *fact* of the apostolical succession, i. e. that our present bishops are the heirs and representatives of the apostles by successive transmission of the prerogative of being so, this is too notorious to require proof. Every link in the chain is known, from St. Peter to our present metropolitans. Here, then, I only ask, looking at this plain fact by itself, is there not something of a divine providence in it? can we conceive that this succession has been preserved, all over the world, amid many revolutions, through many centuries, *for nothing?* Is it wise or pious to despise or neglect a gift thus transmitted to us in matter of fact, even if Scripture did not touch upon the subject?

2. Next, consider how *natural* is the doctrine of a succession. When an individual comes to me, claiming to speak in the name of the Most High, it is natural to ask him for his authority. If he replies, that we are all bound to instruct each other, this reply is intelligible, but in the very form of it excludes the notion of a ministerial order, i. e. a class of persons set apart *from* others for religious offices. If he appeals to some miraculous gift, this too is intelligible, and only unsatisfactory when the alleged gift is proved to be a fiction. No other answer can be given, except a reference to some person, who has given him license to exercise ministerial functions; then follows the question, *how* that individual gained his authority to do so. In the case of the catholic Church, the person referred to, i. e. the bishop, has received it from a predecessor, and he from another, and so on, till we arrive at the apostles themselves, and thence our Lord and Saviour. It is superfluous to dwell on so plain a principle, which in matters of this world we act upon daily.

3. Lastly, the *argument from Scripture* is surely quite clear to those, who honestly wish direction for *practice.* Christ promised he would be with his apostles always, as ministers of his religion, even unto the end of the world. In one sense the apostles were to be alive, till he came again; but they all died at the natural time. Does it not follow, that there are those now alive who represent them? Now who were the most probable representatives of them in the generation next, their death? They surely, whom they have ordained to succeed them in the ministerial work. If any persons could be said to have Christ's power and presence, and the gifts of ruling and ordaining, of teaching, of binding and loosing, (and comparing together the various Scriptures on the subject, all these seem included in his promise to be with the Church always,) surely those, on whom the apostles laid their hands, were they. And so in the next age, if any were representatives of the first representatives, they must be the next generation of bishops, and so on. Nor does it materially alter the argument, though we suppose the blessing upon ministerial offices made, not to the apostles, but to the whole body of disciples: i. e. the Church. For, even if it be the Church that has the power of ordination committed to it, still it exercises it through the bishops as its organs; and the question recurs, *how* has the Presbytery in this or that country obtained the power? The Church certainly has from the first committed it to the bishops, and has never resumed it; and the bishops have nowhere committed it to the Presbytery, who therefore cannot be in possession of it.

However, it is merely for argument sake that I make this allowance, as to the meaning of the text in Matt. xxviii. At the same time, let it be observed what force is added to the argument for the apostolic succession, by the acknowledged existence in Scripture of the doctrine of a standing Church, or permanent body corporate for spiritual purposes. For if Scripture has formed all Christians into one continuous community through all ages, (which I do not here prove,) it is but according to the same analogy, that the ministerial office should be vested in an order, propagated from age to age, on a principle of succession. And, if we proceed to considerations of utility and expedience, it is plain, that, according to our notions, it is more necessary that a ministry should be perpetuated by a fixed law, than that the community of Christians should be, which can scarcely be considered to be vested with any powers, such as to require the visible authority which a succession supplies.—*English Tract.*

ORIGIN OF ST. JAMES' CHURCH, NEW-LONDON.

From a Sermon by Robert A. Hallam, Rector of said church.

(*Concluded.*)

The vacancy occasioned by his removal occurred at a second period of unusual interest to the cause of episcopacy in Connecticut, when it received a second impulse by which its progress and increase were promoted. It had been first sought from conviction of its apostolic authority, now its enclosure was entered by many for security against the tides of wild fanaticism and disorder which were threatening to dissolve the goodly fabric erected by the pilgrim fathers.* The spiritual decline and coldness into which their descendants had sunk in the undisturbed enjoyment of their exclusive privileges, (the common fate of ecclesiastical establishments under whatever form,) was arrested by the arrival of the celebrated Whitefield and the violent excitements which succeeded. But the remedy proved scarcely preferable to the disease. Numbers of self-constituted evangelists took up his mantle, and driven with the fervor of misguided zeal and unbridled fanaticism, traversed the country, denouncing the settled pastors; and under the denomination of New-lights recklessly rending asunder the established congregations into factions and schisms, and in the religious assemblies of their followers turning the worship of God into uproar and confusion, under the professed guidance of the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit. From this tempest of spiritual disorder, judicious and thinking men desired some ark of refuge; and many sought and found it in the bosom of the Episcopal Church, where sound doctrine and chastened piety are at once sustained and regulated by scriptural creeds and formularies of devotion. The inhabitants of this place have never been remarkable for excitable elements of character, and accordingly it came out of the fire comparatively unscathed. But the juncture was one which was felt by the members of this congregation to render a vacancy in its pastorship peculiarly calamitous. Accordingly in their petition to the venerable Society for a speedy supply of the vacancy in the mission, they dwell upon this circumstance with much earnestness and feeling. "The very great convulsions," say they, "occasioned here and in divers other places of this colony, by the breaking out of what is called the New-light, make this a melancholy juncture to have our church empty and unsupplied: and the more so in regard that the present discord having set sundry of the most cool and considering people on thinking and reading, there is a promising prospect of these inquiries ending in thorough and well-weighed conformity to our Church: and this again makes it the more necessary that this church should be made happy in the appointment of a missionary, who, for much learning and experimental knowledge in the present state of things, might be equal to the difficulties of the present times." In answer to this petition the Society sent over the Rev. Matthew Graves, a native of England, who arrived here and commenced his ministry probably in the year 1745. At the instance of the Society the parsonage-house was erected for the accommodation of its missionaries in the same year. Naturally amiable and unfeignedly pious, by his conciliating and consistent course, he procured for himself the general esteem and respect of this community. He continued in the faithful exercise of his sacred office till the year 1778, when his attachment to the royal cause and conscientious refusal to abandon the practice of offering public prayers for the king of Great Britain, rendered necessary a dissolution of his connection with the people of his charge.

We have now arrived at the third event which exerted an important influence in changing the condition of the Episcopal Church in this State; an influence in this latter case shared in common with the Church in other portions of our country,—the commencement of the struggle for our national independence. In the war which followed, it is well known that a majority of her clergy and laity adhered to the royal cause. The obvious reasons for this course need not be here detailed. Before we rashly condemn it, we should endeavor to realize the very trying circumstances which led to its adoption. The immediate effects of the revolution upon the Episcopal Church were mournfully disastrous. Her clergy exiled or silenced, her desolate temples made the objects of wanton desecration and popular violence, her members subjected to universal suspicion and painful restraint; "they that had evil will at Zion" exulted at her overthrow and foretold her utter extinction. But the promise of her Head and Founder that "the gates of hell should not prevail," stood fast. God "in a little wrath hid his face from her for a moment, but with everlasting kindness will he have mercy upon her." We are permitted to see her risen from her ashes, having received "a garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness," with invigorated strength and augmented beauty going forth in her Saviour's name to do his gracious errand, turning the waste places of our spreading country into "the garden of the Lord," and carrying the knowledge of the Saviour to "the uttermost ends of the earth." We can have no hesitation in saying that the revolution, in its ultimate influence, has been as beneficial to our Church as to our country; that it rescued it from the combined and injurious operation of foreign patronage and domestic prejudice: that it demonstrated its capability to exist and thrive without the support of civil power or connection with the state; proved its admirable adaptation to the institutions of a free government; threw its members upon their own efforts, developed its resources and enlarged its sphere of exertion. In the immediate calamities brought upon the Church by the revolution, this congregation experienced its full share. It remained without a pastor till the close of the war, and its sanctuary in the interval seldom or never echoed the sounds of prayer and praise, save when for a season the use of it was courteously extended to the Congregational Society, when the inclemency of the weather and the dilapidated condition of their own house of prayer rendered such an accommodation acceptable; the kind reciprocation of which courtesy we have recently experienced and would now gratefully acknowledge. The 6th of September, 1781, is memorable for the conflagration of this place by the act of an invading army under the perfidious guidance of a traitor to his country. Then "the holy and beautiful house where our fathers worshipped was burned with fire, and all our pleasant things were laid waste." With the return of peace, the members of our congregation rallied from their discouragement; and so early as the spring of 1783, incipient measures were taken for the erection of a church, which resulted in the completion of the edifice in which we are now assembled; though the foundation was not laid till 1785, and the work was not finished till the summer of 1787. While, however, the members of our communion were engaged in the erection of this church, God had provided for them a richer blessing in a pastor, that eminent servant of Christ, "whose praise is in the Gospel throughout all the churches," the Right Rev. Samuel Seabury, D. D., the son of their first minister, the first Bishop of this Diocese, and the first Bishop of the Church in these United States. The Churchmen of Connecticut were such upon conviction, as the result of study and careful investigation; and their first care after their connection with the mother Church had been in the providence of God dissolved, was to provide for the perpetuation of that ministry and those institutions which they so dearly prized. Dr. Seabury was elected their first bishop, and after his application for consecration had been rejected in England simply on political considerations,* was consecrated to the Episcopal office on the fourth of November, 1784, at Aberdeen, in Scotland. This congregation gladly availed themselves of the opportunity to secure his valuable services as its rector. On his return to this country, he immediately entered on the duties of his office. By him this church was consecrated on the 20th of September, 1787. He continued in the diligent discharge of his duties as a bishop and a pastor till he was suddenly removed by death on the 25th of February, 1796. But "still," in the language of the monumental tablet near me, on which his flock have recorded their sorrow for his loss and their respect for his memory, he "lives in the hearts of a grateful diocese;" I may add, in the respect and veneration of the Church at large, in the regulation of whose affairs, and the review and improvement of whose liturgy, his wisdom rendered important service.

* The effects of the new-light excitement upon the Congregational churches in New-England were extensive, deplorable, and lasting. In very many places separate congregations were formed, some of which in time became regular members of the Congregational bodies, and some dwindled away and became extinct. The settled pastors were denounced as "blind guides," and "dumb dogs;" and in the frenzy of feeling, acts the most disgraceful were performed as the effects of a divine impulse. Whitefield himself visited this place, and so did Davenport, one of the most extravagant of his imitators; and the Rev. Mr. Adams. then the Congregational minister here, was publicly informed that hell was paved with the skulls of the victims of his unfaithfulness. He was, however, a man of singular moderation and prudence, as well as of remarkable piety; and by his good management a schism in his church was prevented. A modern writer, speaking of Davenport, says, "In his travels from Stonington to New-Haven (in 1741) he is represented as condemning almost all the ministers, and particularly the aged and venerable Mr. Adams." "He commanded the people of Mr. Adams to withdraw from him, and a number of the communicants withdrew from him as being *a carnal old Pharisee.* When questioned on the subject afterward at Boston, he owned the fact, acknowledged that he had passed but a few minutes in conversation with Mr. Adams, and that his decision upon Mr. Adams' religious character was grounded on the fact 'that he had no experience of hatred to God, and of extraordinary comforts and joys.' He continued for some time in Connecticut, an outrageous schismatic, in almost every place praying against the minister of the parish as unconverted, and saying that 'thousands are now cursing him in hell for being the instrument of their damnation, and frequently calling him 'a hypocrite, a wolf in sheep's clothing, and a devil incarnate.'" Such was the state of things which drew forth the sentiments expressed in the petition of the vestry of this church, quoted in the discourse. The cause of religion in New-England long suffered under the effects of the reaction which followed. The Episcopal Church was, however, unquestionably a gainer.

* The English bishops, as officers of an established Church, could not consecrate Dr. Seabury without an acknowledgment of the king's supremacy as head of the Church of England, and an oath of allegiance to him as such, without a special dispensation by act of Parliament. The irritation consequent upon the revolutionary conflict prevented this. Hence he was forced to resort to the Scotch bishops. These derived their succession from the non-juring or Jacobite prelates, who were deprived at the accession of William and Mary, for their conscientious adherence to James II. The obstacles to the consecration of American bishops in England were afterward removed, and Bishops White and Provoost were consecrated by Archbishop Moore, of Canterbury, at Lambeth, Feb. 4, 1787. The circumstances of Bishop Seabury's consecration prevented the entire and cordial union of the Church in Connecticut with the Church in the other States for some years. His intercourse with the Episcopal Church in Scotland produced a strong attachment to that branch of the Christian body, and the effect of it is now manifest in the fact that in many of those particulars in which our Book of Common Prayer differs from that of the Church of England, it is conformed to the Prayer-book of the Church of Scotland. This was occasioned by the influence of Bishop Seabury, when the Prayer-book was reviewed and settled after the peace.

From the British Magazine.

AN ADDRESS ON THE DEVOTIONAL USE OF THE CHURCH SERVICE.

It appears to be a fault in the character of the religion of our day, that too *exclusive* importance is attached to preaching, to the neglect of the other part of the divine service. Yet, needful as it is that we should hear of Jesus Christ and his salvation from the pulpit, this is certainly not more needful than that we should have "communion with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ," in prayer and in the holy eucharist. The *congregational* use of our highly-prized liturgy could not fail very much to promote such communion. Every one must feel the great difference of the Church service when it is merely *read over* by the minister and the clerk *in the hearing* of the congregation, and when it is used *in behalf of* and *with* the congregation,—all feeling their interest in the prayers and praises, and all evincing that interest by cordially and audibly uniting in the responses.

If such were our practice, the service of our Church would no longer be regarded as cold and formal, and the best answer would be furnished to those who may bring this accusation against it.

It is therefore earnestly to be desired that each worshipper would charge it upon himself, or herself, as an imperative duty, to promote, as far as possible, the devotional character of our service:—

First. By diligently attending to the directions of the Rubric.

Secondly. By repeating all the responses, not omitting the "Amen" at the end of each prayer, in an audible voice.

Thirdly. By joining in the singing, with the best endeavor to produce devotional harmony.

Let every one feel that this is not a trivial matter, but one which is worthy of the effort; that we may with one heart and with one mouth glorify God our heavenly Father, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

From the British Critic.

VOLTAIRE AND ROUSSEAU.

Voltaire and Rousseau differed from Hume and Gibbon, in that the latter were men who did not avail themselves of their fancied irresponsibility for the purposes of immorality. It is true that Gibbon's feelings were of the grossest order, otherwise his history had not been so gratuitously defiled; but they were comparatively latent. Perhaps the true explanation of this would be, that the contemplation of sin was itself so exquisitely gratifying to his depraved taste, that overt satisfactions were unnecessary.

But Voltaire and Rousseau were the incarnations of immorality; the cups from which they quaffed their pleasures held sensuality distilled. Voltaire's caustic cynicism, and Rousseau's tender sentimentalism, though qualities so opposed, gave them the mutual resemblance of intense selfishness. It is true that the one delighted in the feeling of isolated superiority, while the other sought for the interfusion of his sympathies with those of his fellow-beings. Voltaire despised human nature; Rousseau adored her. Yet the frown and the smile were purest selfishness. Voltaire contemned "the ministers to his pleasure;" Rousseau loved them as indispensable companions, as nothing more. Both scorned the name of virtue; never were there men more dissimilar in mind, more similar in morals. When Voltaire visited Pope, even the bard of Twickenham blushed at the pollution of his mind. Gray's epigram upon his prostituted talents was too true:—

"You are so witty, profligate, and thin,
At once we think thee Milton, death, and sin."

The Confessions of Rousseau are unfit to be read.

If Quinctilian felt the importance of good morals as an accompaniment to the shrewdest reasoning, in order that the latter might convince, so that he insisted that an advocate should be a good man, it is fair in us to demand the same qualification in an impugner of Christianity, if he be above suspicion.

It may be justly surmised that the unbelief of a bad man is not from a love of truth, but from a love of sin. He is an interested witness; he has suborned himself to lie against his Judge. But we would not charge this upon the men before us, (not because we think it too severe, or too hypothetical, but because the language of accusation is so unfit for the language of debate,) if we did not honestly believe that this is the common characteristic of their class. In fact, others may be self-deluded by philosophical speculation; these are insincere. The one are blind, the other masked. The moment a man comes to the examination of the evidence of Christianity, recognising the genuine laws of demonstration, we believe them to be so irrefragable, so conclusive, that even his fancied disproof of them is impossible. A man awake, in broad, unclouded day, cannot persuade himself there is no sun. We tax Voltaire and Rousseau with hypocrisy. One day Voltaire insulted our blessed Lord with the blasphemy, "Down with the wretch;" another day he partook of the symbols of his body. We have no more eloquent or just comparison between the perfect man of paganism and the "example" of the Gospel, followed with a declaration of the latter's superiority as *infinite*, than in the well-known parallel by Rousseau.

NATURAL THEOLOGY, CONSIDERED WITH REFERENCE TO LORD BROUGHAM'S DISCOURSE.

By Thomas Turton, D. D., Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge. London: J. W. Parker. 1836. 12mo.

Dr. Turton has done Lord Brougham great honor and the public great service by this volume. It is his design in it both to commend and recommend whatever is really valuable in Lord Brougham's "Discourse," to point *out* what is erroneous, and supply what is deficient. This is done with that peculiar simplicity and candor which distinguishes every thing from Dr. Turton's hand. But it is really a very serious book for Lord Brougham, for it points out inaccuracies, mistakes, and errors, both in facts and reasoning, which are quite surprising, and make one feel, that however great and various Lord Brougham's powers unquestionably are, it is in vain that one man attempts to spread himself over such a variety of subjects, and that the result can only be vague and superficial views and reasonings, and too often positive error. The way in which Lord Brougham has spoken of the works of one writer after another is shown by Dr. Turton to be so utterly incorrect, rash, and unjust, his views of the ancient philosophy so incorrect, and his facts so terribly small in quantity, that it would have been far better for his fame to have let all such subjects alone.—*British Magazine.*

WORKS ON EPISCOPACY.

Printed at New-York. London: Rivingtons; Hatchards; and Seeley. 2 vols. 12mo. pp. xxiv., 784.

In the number for May, 1835, (vol. vii. p. 582,) an account was given of the several treatises contained in this masterly defence of Episcopacy against the objections of *all* dissenters, and particularly of the American Presbyterian, Dr. Miller, whose attack on the constitution and ministry of the Church has been advertised for republication in this country. The promise then given, of announcing the arrival in London of the "Works on Episcopacy," is now redeemed; and the hope formerly expressed, "that all those readers who can afford to purchase will procure copies" is renewed; especially when it is added that they are sold at a price which barely covers the expense of importation, advertising, and booksellers' commission.

British Magazine.

It is a remarkable circumstance, also, that the first provincial meeting for the formation of an auxiliary Bible society at Edinburgh, was held in the very room in which David Hume, the infidel, died.

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL PRESS, PRINT.